

THE BIBLICAL UNDERSTANDING OF MAN

By VESELIN KESICH

Every book in the Bible speaks of man. Its message is addressed to him. Throughout the Bible we find man responding to God's revelation. Man's nature and his destiny is never considered in isolation, but always in connection with the central biblical themes or events, such as the creation, covenant, incarnation, the death and resurrection of Christ. Man is created by God, and therefore he belongs to Him. He "made us" and He took the initiative in establishing a covenant with men, requiring loyalty and obedience. "If you will obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples, for all the earth is mine" (Ex. 19:5). In the New Testament, St. Paul always speaks of man in terms of Christ: man before the coming of Christ, man who does not know Christ, or man "in Christ." He maintained that man does not belong to himself: "You are not your own; you were bought with a price" (I Cor. 6:20). Here St. Paul refers to God's creative act in the beginning as well as to the decisive event of Christ's death on the cross. He understands man in terms of creation and redemption. Man is related to God as both Creator and Redeemer; this is consistently present in the Bible.

To illuminate the Biblical view of man and to point to its essential unity in both the Old and New Testament, we shall concentrate upon the first chapters of Genesis as expressing the Old Testament perspective, without which the New Testament teaching about man cannot be understood, referring as well to selected passages in the epistles of St. Paul. In our discussion we shall try to bring out the meaning and relevance of the biblical perspective on man for our time.

I

There are two different accounts of man's creation in Gen. 1-2, yet their message is the same. In both of them man's coming into the world is due to God's creative love. The opening chapters

of Genesis present the creation of man not as an emanation from God but as a positive act of creation. Man's life is not lived by God but is given by God as a gift. He "saw everything that he had made and beheld it was very good" (Gen. 1:31). Everything that came into existence was in full harmony with God's purpose.

When we are told that God created the world and all that is on it, no material substance is mentioned. Only when the author of Genesis comes to the creation of man does he specify the material out of which man is formed: "Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being" (Gen. 2:7). This may indicate the importance of man in God's plan of creation, his unique relation to God, which Gen. 1:26f expressed as being created in the image of God. The special status of man is fully captured by the psalmist:

When I look at thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
the moon and the stars which thou has established;
what is man that thou art mindful of him,
and the son of man that thou dost care for him?
Yet thou hast made him little less than God,
and dost crown him with glory and honor,
Thou hast given him dominion over the works of thy hands;
thou hast put all things under his feet.

.....

O Lord, our Lord,
how majestic is thy name in all the earth! (Ps. 8:3ff).

The story of woman's creation in Genesis is particularly significant. No similar story can be found in Babylonian mythology, which was known to the ancient Hebrews. Genesis and the Babylonian myth of creation or Enuma Elish differ profoundly on the origin of the sexes, as well as on the role and place of man and woman in God's creation. Enuma Elish starts off with a picture of the primeval waters, which are personified as Apsu and Tiamat. While the first represents sweet fresh water, the second stands for the sea, the salty waters. Out of an intermingling of these waters, out of their union, the gods are born. Thus in the Babylonian myth male and female principles are deified and precede both theogony and cosmogony. On the other hand, no myth of the creation of woman as such exists in Babylonian mythology.

The sexual imagery is absent from Genesis. "Male" and

"female" are not symbols of divine power, but belong to the sphere of God's creation, which He precedes and transcends.

Whereas Genesis 1 relates that male and female were created on the same "day," in Genesis 2 the creation of woman comes after man was formed (Gen. 2:18-24). Why is so much attention given to the creation of woman? We are prepared gradually for woman's appearance. The narrative starts with the words of Yahweh: "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him." These words in the context of Gen. 2 imply that man cannot live without a community, and that his life with God is not to be separated from his life and growth in the community. The beasts of the field and birds of the air are not on man's level and cannot be his companions. They are not "fit for him," but woman is. The "rib" out of which woman is created underlines the nature of this community. Woman is neither "above" nor "beneath" but at man's side. She is with him. Real community is expressed by the word "with," a community of distinct persons.

By separating the creation of woman from that of man and distinguishing the time of creation, the author of Genesis and the tradition upon which he relies underline the distinction between the sexes and not the subordination of woman to man. Rooted in the very structure of creation, this distinction emphasizes the difference between them and excludes the interchangeability of male and female functions. St. Paul writes about the wrath of God that is revealed from heaven against the "wickedness of men" involved in "dishonorable passions." What he means by these expressions he relates clearly and directly: "Their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural, and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in their own persons the due penalty for their error" (Rom. 1:26-27).

The distinction of the sexes is not ended "in Christ" as some people in the Church of Corinth may have thought. It is true that St. Paul proclaimed "there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). Our oneness in Christ, however, does not obliterate the created difference between the sexes. St. Paul could not have thought that it ceased to exist. "You are the body of Christ," he reminds the Corinthians, "and individually members of it" (I Cor. 12:27). Among the members

12 THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

of the body of Christ, secondary differences, the products of social and historical conditions, are brought to an end, but not primary distinctions, without which the community would not exist. In I Corinthians, St. Paul, among other problems, is concerned with a "new theology" of sex that had emerged in some circles of this local church. It is quite probable that his words had been misinterpreted to mean that Christ was not only the end of the Law but also of distinctions between sexes. To repudiate this erroneous view, St. Paul builds his argument in I Cor. 11 upon the creation stories of Gen. 2. "Man was not made from woman, but woman from man" (11:8-9), and "In the Lord woman is not independent of man nor men of woman; for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God" (11:11-12). A third reference, which to a large degree determine the interpretation of the whole chapter, is not as obvious as these two. It is 11:3: "The head of a woman is her husband." The word *kephalē* means "origin" as well as "head."¹ Against the background of Genesis, St. Paul means that man is the origin, not the lord, of woman. If we read I Cor. 11 with Gen. 2, then the main interest of chapter 11 is not in subordinating woman but in stressing the importance of differentiating sexes and in repudiating the non-Biblical teaching of those who wanted to believe that "in Christ" the distinction between male and female is brought to an end.

II

That God created man in His image, after His likeness, first of all signifies that there is a correspondence between God and man. God calls and man responds. To "have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28), man reflects God's sovereignty upon the earth.

Throughout the centuries Christian theologians have been interpreting Gen. 1:26-28 extensively. These verses are revelatory, inspired and full of meaning. Yet what the "image" and "likeness" meant to the original readers must also be important and relevant for us today. In their biblical context the words express something so basic that without them there is no distinct biblical view of man that we can speak of.

First of all, let us point to an apologetic element of this creation account. To do this we must refer to the Babylonian myth of creation. After the victory over Tiamat and her forces, led by her

spouse Kingu, Marduk started with the work of creating the universe. Upon the completion of this work, which actually was not creation but a reordering, Marduk turned to the creation of man, whom he had conceived in his heart:

Blood will I form and cause bone to be;

Then will I set up lullu, "Man" be his name!

Yes, I will create lullu: Man!

[Upon him] shall the services of the gods be imposed,
that they may be at rest.²

But the wise god Ea made him change his mind. He advised Marduk that one of the defeated gods be destroyed and that men be fashioned from him. Kingu was found responsible for creating the strife; therefore he was punished and with his blood the victorious gods created mankind. Thus this myth speaks about the creation of man from the blood of a bad god, with the purpose of relieving the gods of any work.

Now let us return to Gen. 1:26ff. The words "image" (*selem*) and "likeness" (*demut*) are used to indicate a similarity between God and man that manifests itself in bodily appearance. Whereas the term "image" is more concrete, the concept of "likeness" may point to a similarity which is not necessarily of a bodily or physical character. Both the "image" and "likeness" exclude man's creation out of God's substance. Genesis stresses that man is not created from divine blood (*dam*) but in the divine likeness (*demut*). "The similarity of sound between the words for 'likeness' and 'blood' rendered the concept that God had created man in his own 'likeness' an especially effective counter to the popular view that the gods had created man from divine 'blood.'"³

The meaning of our narrative goes beyond the distinction which we have seen here. Its truth transcends apologetics as well as racial, social and religious barriers among men. If the "image" or "likeness" does not express any "particular quality of man" but "simply being man," then the image is not to be applied to Jews or Christians but "equally to the Hindu, the Mohammedan, the Christian, secularized man, the atheist. No human being can be excepted," writes Claus Westermann. "It says what being a creature means for man. Man's dignity is founded on his being a creature; God, by creating man in his own image, has given man his human dignity." Then this writer proceeds to point out that the dignity ascribed to man in the Bible differs from the secular view in this. "It says something not only about human worth but also about the meaning of human existence; man—everyman—is

created for this purpose: namely, that something may happen between him and God and that thereby his life may receive a meaning."⁴ A command is given to man: "You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die" (2:16-17). This command makes sense only if man is free. The command is given that man should relate himself to God in freedom. No other type of relationship would correspond either to God who created him or to man who bears the stamp of God's image. From man God simply asks obedience, which is both the condition and the content of man's life as related to God. Obedience is impossible without freedom. Where freedom is absent, obedience becomes submission. The command is a reminder that the source of man's life is not in himself but in God. It is a call for man's constant effort to grow in the image in which he was created.

III

There have been attempts to interpret the term "image" only spiritually and to exclude its bodily aspect. The image of God in which man is created, as well as the creation of man from dust to which the breath of God is given, refers to man as a "psycho-physical totality." The term "image," therefore, should not be reduced to only one of man's qualities.

"Man is a body," (Robinson) a living being; that is what the Bible teaches about man. In the biblical view man as body means man as a whole. Being body, he is able to communicate with others. Body is the means of union with others, the principle of solidarity. The teaching "man is a body" differs from some ancient and modern views that man has a body.

Just because he is "body" man praises God. Those in Sheol do not praise Him, for they are without body. St. Paul cannot imagine a *post-mortem* existence for those who are "in Christ" without a kind of body even before the general resurrection and the last judgment. After death their life is not one of isolation, fearfulness and ghostly existence, for they belong to the Body of Christ. "For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made by hands, eternal in heaven" (II Cor. 5:1).

The creation and the fall of man are clearly separated in Genesis; there is no intrinsic link between them. The Bible does

not identify the body and corruption. The body is the work of God, writes St. John Chrysostom, and death and corruption are consequences of sin. The body may become corrupt, but the body as such is not to be identified with corruption. This is the biblical understanding of the relationship between the body and corruption. What is the future of the body? Again on this point Chrysostom expresses himself unambiguously and offers a biblical answer to the biblical question: "the future life shatters and abolishes not the body, but that which clings to it, corruption and death."⁵ The body was created by God and will be resurrected by the power of God. In both the old and the new creation man is seen as body. With Christ's victory over death and corruption, the new creation has already started, and with it the transformation of man, who now may grow in Christ, who is the image of God (2 Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15).

The Bible also speaks of man as flesh. "Man as flesh" means man as a whole, in his weakness and with his limitations. Flesh as such is not evil, nor is it the source of evil. "Man is evil when his will is evil," in Bultmann's succinct phrase. Sin is not being in flesh but living according to the flesh. He who trusts in the flesh produces the fruits of flesh, which are "immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, party spirit, envy, drunkenness, carousing and the like" (Gal. 5:19-21). The works of the flesh in this list are those which we might tend to divide into two categories, the "flesh" and the "soul," but here St. Paul ascribes all of them to the flesh. There is no dualism between the "flesh" and the "soul" here, and the fruits of the flesh once again bring out the Biblical insight that man as flesh stands for man as a whole.

To live according to the flesh is to strive to be independent, autonomous. It is to use one's freedom without regard for others, without desire for renunciation. Freedom that is not limited by love or consideration for others destroys itself and enslaves the one who practices it (I Cor. 6). The heretical teachers of the New Testament epistles are characterized by their lack of love for the community and by their exercise of freedom for themselves.

Man who lives according to the flesh is an autonomous man who lives a closed existence. He refuses to believe in Christ and wants to live "according to the flesh." The product of this refusal and desire is a Sisyphean man who is "his own God and his own Satan: at war with heaven, embittered with earth and contemptuous of hell."⁶

IV

The predominant perspective on man in the Bible is non-dualistic. There is in it no body-soul dichotomy, no immortal self free from pain and sorrow. In the Bible dualism is overcome, as there is no division between soul and body. The biblical authors ascribe to the soul almost physical, bodily attributes or functions and psychical qualities to the body. Thus, for example, we find the following: "Like cold water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country" (Prov. 25:25), or "therefore my loins are filled with anguish" (Isa. 22:3), or "Come to me, all you who labor and are overburdened . . . and you will find rest for your souls" (Matt. 11:28-30). What we may consider as belonging to the body only belongs to the soul also and vice versa. And in all these cases man as a whole is meant. When the body of man is regarded as a hindrance to the soul, the soul and the body are conceived in opposition to each other, and finally, as a logical development, the body is rejected for the sake of the soul's deliverance. In the biblical doctrines of creation, incarnation, resurrection and final consummation, this dualistic view has no place. Along with dualism the teachings of the immortality and transmigration of souls are absent from the Bible. They are simply incompatible with the Biblical view of man. As H. Wheeler Robinson has observed, "The Hebrew idea of personality is an animated body, and not an incarnated soul."

But what about St. Paul? If dualism cannot be traced in Genesis, then what about the dualism as reflected in St. Paul's epistles? They have been analyzed very closely precisely from this angle. The results of this investigation are not surprising. St. Paul was deeply rooted in the Scriptures. He rejected all those dualistic speculations that led to the glorification of Adam in Hellenistic Judaism. It was Philo who introduced the distinction between the heavenly and earthly Adam. He saw in Gen. 1 the creation of the heavenly man, a view inspired by and similar to Plato's idea, and in Gen. 2 the creation of the earthly man, who is the copy of the pattern of the first man.⁷ This distinction does not have a place in Pauline theology or anthropology. For St. Paul, Jesus, the historical Jesus, who died and was raised up, is at the same time the heavenly man. This thinking is not the product of speculation but is forced upon him by Scripture, experience and by the fact of history. "The heavenly man" is not incompatible with matter.

There is no metaphysical dualism here. The dualism we find in his letters is an ethical one, a dualism of will,⁸ conflict and tension between spirit and flesh, between God and man.

There are "dualistic forms of expression" in St. John's gospel and epistles, and yet these writings are free of any "natural and timeless" dualism. Neither does St. John's dualism of the world point to this type. Sin does not come from being in the world, but in being "of the world," which corresponds to being "not of God," and the corruption of the man "of the world" is not due to his "inherent nature" but to his "sinful actions."⁹

What St. Paul and St. John teach about man cannot be separated from what they proclaim and witness to Christ. It is particularly St. Paul who brings out that man's true nature and destiny is manifested in Christ. Jesus' resurrection was a bodily resurrection, which is "the first fruits of all who have fallen asleep" (I Cor. 15:19). There is no spiritual resurrection of Christ which is not at the same time His bodily resurrection. The resurrection should be the beginning and the end for a Christian understanding of man, his nature and destiny.

In conclusion we must stress that the unity and totality of human existence is given at the beginning (Gen. 1-2), in the eschatological event of the death and resurrection of Christ, and is seen as such at the very end, in the consummation of all things (Rev. 20-21). When this end comes, that which is good in the old creation is not thrown away but transformed into the new. The martyrs in the book of Revelation are not without body. They are given "a white robe," which is their "spiritual body." All that God created is good and is destined for "the glory that is to be revealed" (Rom. 8:18). The "good seed" is to grow until the time for "harvest" comes; the new creation is not the repetition of the old but the final fulfillment and transformation of the old. The end is already anticipated. God has been making all things new. As St. Paul writes, "Our inner nature is being renewed every day" (II Cor. 4:16). We are all "being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another" (II Cor. 3:18), and "if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation" (II Cor. 5:17).

Biblical man is a man of tradition. He lives under the impact of memories and expectations. The past is alive for him, and serves as the basis for his growth. He expects new things in the future. But these new things are already active now and are somewhat known to him. "For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face

to face" (I Cor. 13:12). If we take the message of the Genesis creation narrative, the meaning of Christ's resurrection and the vision of the future, then we may conclude that man is destined to life and not to death.

ST. VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY

FOOTNOTES

1. C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2d ed. (London, 1971), on I Cor. 11:2-3.
2. Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 2d ed. (Chicago, 1951), p. 46.
3. J. Maxwell Miller, "In the 'image' and 'likeness' of God," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 91, No. 3 (1972), p. 304.
4. Claus Westermann, *Creation* (Philadelphia, 1974), pp. 59-60.
5. *De resurr. mortuorum*⁶, quoted by Georges Florovsky, "The Gospel of Resurrection (I Cor. 15)," *Paulus - Hellas - Oikoumene, An Ecumenical Symposium* (Athens, 1951), p. 4.
6. Gerhard Gloege, *Aller Tage Tag*, quoted by C.F.D. Moule, *Man and Nature in the New Testament* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, Facet Books), p. 21.
7. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (New York, 1965), pp. 47-59.
8. See C.F.D. Moule, "St. Paul and Dualism: the Pauline Conception of Resurrection," *New Testament Studies*, 12, 2 (1966), pp. 106-23.
9. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Man in the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 76f.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BYZANTINE BURIAL CUSTOMS: CARE OF THE DECEASED FROM DEATH TO THE PROTHESIS

By JAMES KYRIAKAKIS

Concern has been indicated by scholars in recent years for burial practices among ancient cultures.¹ Since these civilizations were the fore-runners, so to speak, of the Eastern Christian world, an examination of Byzantine burial customs is quite timely.

Unfortunately, little has been done in this regard. Nothing has appeared on the subject in English, and only a few studies in French and German even touch on it tangentially.² The Byzantinist Φαίδων Κουκουλές stands out among modern Greek historians who have treated the topic rather briefly.³ A few articles dealing with modern Greek burial customs allude to the earlier Byzantine era, offering limited insights.⁴ The one-thousand year history of Byzantium renders it difficult to handle more than an aspect of the over-all topic, and the present, limited study hopes to do no more than bring together and perhaps broaden the work of the pioneers in the field.

Among the literary sources which help us create a picture of Byzantine burial customs, pride of place (with care taken to distinguish between fact and legend) must be given to the writings of the Church Fathers, especially to such treatises on the subject as Symeon of Thessalonike's (d. 1429) "De Ordine Sepulture."⁵ Of course, the numerous accounts of saints' lives and other biographies are invaluable to such a study. Ecclesiastical and political histories, as well as numerous chronicles, are somewhat less useful literary sources. In this category, particular attention is to be paid to those works which allude to burials of emperors and members of their families, such as the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor and his continuators, the George Pachymeres account of the Palaiologos era, and Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos' treatise of imperial ceremonies.⁶ In addition, quite useful are recorded eulogies, letters of condolence, epigrams, Byzantine

poems and folk-lore, dream-books, law-books and patristic and conciliar canons.

Finally, there is archeological evidence, much of which remains to be uncovered, with the imperial sarcophagi and tombs being especially informative.

The present study is essentially based on the literary evidence, though we have been able to make some use of archeological reports. What we can claim, however, is to have brought together a mass of material on the basis of which it will be possible to proceed further, and it is hoped that this pioneer attempt to present much of the evidence for an aspect of the wider subject of Byzantine burial customs has met with a degree of success.

In an effort to indicate the continuity of these customs in the Byzantine world, evidence will be presented, wherever possible, from the early, middle and late periods.⁷ In addition, brief comments will be included about practices in antiquity in order to indicate precedents and influences, as well as of the modern Greeks, who are successors of the Byzantines.

We shall concern ourselves with four aspects of the care of the dead before the actual burial: (1) The First Cares for the Deceased; (2) Washing, Anointing and Wrapping of the Deceased; (3) Dressing and Adorning of the Deceased; and (4) The Prothesis, or Lying-in-State. As indicated by these section titles, our concern will be limited to cares taken for the corpse and, therefore, customs having to do with mourning will not be treated.

The First Cares for the Deceased

Immediately after a person died, the Byzantines lowered the corpse from the death-bed to a low cot on the floor, which, as in the description of the death of Peter I, Bishop of Alexandria (d. 311), was called *kline*.⁸ The same act is described by St. Gregory of Nyssa upon the death of St. Makrina (d. 379), his sister, and that of St. Basil the Great, but here the term *chameunion*⁹ is used in referring to this pallet. Nor was the word *skamnion* uncommon for depicting the same cot, as is seen in the life of St. Pelagia and others.¹⁰ Lowering of the body from the death-bed for preliminary preparations was common amongst the Romans, who first closed the deceased's eyes and raised the *conclamatio*, as well as amongst the Jews.¹¹

As will be noted repeatedly below, the entire preparation of the corpse for burial in ancient cultures was a duty undertaken by

the immediate relatives. However, the greater part of these cares during the Byzantine Empire was left to domestic aides or a burial society. An exception seems to have been the very first attentions paid the corpse immediately following death and lowering from the death-bed, which remained the case throughout Byzantine history and is the practice in many parts of modern Greece until today.

The first of such cares was the closing of the eyes and mouth, acts performed by the immediate relatives upon death since the Homeric era until modern times.¹² We see these, for example, to be among the first considerations shown the dead heroes in both Homeric epics,¹³ as well as in the literature of the later centuries of ancient Greece.¹⁴ As indicated by many literary and archeological sources, this custom was widely accepted in the ancient Roman¹⁵ and Jewish¹⁶ cultures as well.

The term *kalyptein* for depicting the closing of the eyes seems to have been the word most used by the Byzantine writers, appearing in such works as the supplement to the chronography of the eighth century historian Theophanes,¹⁷ and the epic *Digenes Akritas* of the tenth or eleventh century.¹⁸ The wide use of this term is further emphasized by the fact that it remains most popular today.¹⁹ Other terms, such as *kathairein*²⁰ were not as widely used.

The closing of the mouth, called *sygkleiein*,²¹ took place at the same time as the shutting of the eyes. The people of Byzantium paid special attention to seeing that the mouth was closed swiftly following death, as did their ancestors in ancient Greece. This concern was the result of the fear that the soul, which abandoned the body with the last breath, or even an evil spirit might enter the corpse through its open mouth.²² This possibility was such a pre-occupation among the Byzantines, and particularly those in monastic life, that those about to expire took measures to protect themselves against such a spiritual catastrophe. Indeed, the Byzantine mentality on this matter reached even beyond the borders of the empire, for we are told that the nun Anastasia who was dying in Egypt made the sign of the Cross over her mouth as she breathed her last.²³ Of course, by at least the fifth century the Cross was regarded as a powerful, symbolic protection against all evil forces. Chrysostom strongly emphasized this when he said:

These are the things which the cross accomplished for us: the cross is the banner against demons, the dagger against sin,

the sword by which Christ slew the serpent; the cross is the will of the Father, the glory of the Onlybegotten, the joy of the Spirit, the decor of the angels, the protection of the Church, the pride of Paul, the wall of the saints, the light of the entire universe.²⁴

Orthodox monks, particularly those following the tradition of Mount Athos, habitually bless their mouths with the sign of the Cross before eating, supposedly as a protective measure, again, against the entrance of evil spirits.²⁵ A further manifestation of this concern that the mouth of the corpse be closed, was the custom which the Byzantines observed (as did the ancient Greeks and others) of tying the lower jaw securely to the head that the mouth not fall open.²⁶

As stated earlier, the closing of the eyes and mouth was a task performed by the immediate relatives throughout all ages of Greek history until today. To be sure, this custom was observed with particular attention by the Byzantines; the performance of this service was regarded not only as a duty, but also as an honor. The particular importance placed upon this privilege can be seen in the request by St. Makrina that her brother Gregory close her eyes after her death:

After she was breathless and unmoving, remembering the requests which she made at our first meeting by which she said that she desired that I set my hands upon her eyes, and that the prescribed attention to the body be rendered by me, I advanced my hand, which was dead from pain, to her holy face, for I wanted not to neglect her request.

However, because Makrina had confronted death as though she were merely falling asleep (and thus her eyes were perfectly closed, her lips shut, and her hands folded over her breast), she therefore "had no need of the hand of those who laid out the dead."²⁷ The rendering of this service to the dead, one must observe, was considered not only a duty prescribed by law, but a sacred obligation as well; for, no situation could justify its omission. Eusebios provides us with pertinent information from the correspondence of Dionysios, Bishop of Alexandria (d. 265), who wrote memoirs of conditions following a plague in the city.

So, too, the bodies of the saints they would take up in their open hands to their bosom, closing their eyes and shutting their mouths, carrying them on their shoulders and laying them out; they would cling to them, embrace them, bathe

and adorn them with their burial clothes, and after a little receive the same services themselves, for those that were left behind were ever following those that went before.²⁸

Nor were the members of the imperial family exempt from this custom. The twelfth-century Byzantine philosopher Theodoros Prodromos provides us with an apt example in his poetic account of the mourning of the death of the emperor John II Komnenos (d. 1143) by his wife Irene. The widow, recalling the ways in which she served her husband, is depicted as saying: "Who closed your eyelids?"²⁹ To be sure, there are many accounts of this custom in all types of literature of the Byzantine centuries, and the same mentality regarding it survives widely in modern Greece.³⁰ Of particular interest is the legend about the woman who, having died, reached up and closed her own eyes because nobody had come forth to do so.³¹

At least to this point in the preparation it was the immediate members of the family who cared for the deceased. What followed immediately after was the arranging of the corpse in a position which was prescribed by law since at least the fourth century legislation of Constantine the Great. This legal prescription was continued into the sixth century by Anastasios I and was included in Justinian's *Codex*.³² Cause for this legislation, one deduces, was the lack of proper attention to the arranging of the limbs of the deceased unto appropriate burial. An immediate result, fully systematized by Justinian, was the emergence of a class called *lectiarii* and *copiate*,³³ among whose functions was to arrange the corpse's limbs appropriately.

The importance of stretching out the arms and legs, and arranging the head of the deceased cannot be emphasized enough, for the Byzantine religious mentality demanded it. That is to say, there can be no doubt that the Byzantines viewed death as a falling asleep, a belief which permeated the thinking of the ancient world as well on this subject.³⁴ Thus, as was likely the case in the concerted effort to close the eyes and mouth, a preoccupation with having the deceased appear to be asleep is indicated by the careful and judicially prescribed arranging of the extremities.

In this context, it is important to note that although the word *θάνατος* (death) was that most commonly used in Byzantium to describe expiration, the term *κοίμησις* (dormition) was also widely utilized. Such was the case particularly among the Church Fathers and other ecclesiastically oriented writers, among whom

we find Chrysostom preaching:

Concerning those who are asleep [I Thes. 4:12] know that death is a sleep. For just as when we see someone sleeping we do not become loud nor distraught, knowing that eventually he will arise, so likewise when we see someone deceased, let us not become loud or throw ourselves down; for this also is a sleep, longer perhaps, but a sleep. By the term dormition the bereaved were consoled and the argument of the faithless was destroyed.³⁵

Perhaps because of the religious significance which was attached to the moment of death, the writers of saints' lives go to great pains to describe the most precise details of their subject's last moments, and here we find much information about the arranging of the head and limbs. For example, the author of the life of Saint Melania, a fifth-century religious, emphasizes the fact that the deceased's legs were stretched out immediately following her death. He does not fail, furthermore, to relate an incident which points up for us the obvious preoccupation with the performance of this duty. We are informed that those attending the dying nun, believing that she had expired, began to stretch out her legs prematurely. Melania at this point proceeded to assure them that she would advise them of the exact moment of death so that they could perform this service.³⁶ Chrysostom affords us an example of this and other cares bestowed upon the deceased when, relating the actions of parents at their child's death-bed, he says:

When a child's parents see him struggling in his final breaths, they sit around, listen to his last words, clasp his hands, add promises which they do not expect to fulfill, kiss his mouth, these being the final kisses of the parents. Then, once the child has given up the spirit, the parents arrange him as per his request; they stretch out the arms, close the eyes, straighten the head, stretch out the legs . . .

No doubt, the custom of stretching out the limbs swiftly after death was related to the pliable condition of the corpse prior to the setting in of rigormortis.³⁷

At this point the jaw was secured by passing a cord or ribbon beneath the chin and tying it at the top of the head. This was done, as mentioned above, to insure against the mouth reopening and also to prevent disfigurement of the facial features.³⁸

Mention must be made here of the extraordinary cares taken for the corpse of an emperor who died while away from Con-

stantinople, examples of which, among others, we have in the cases of Constantine the Great who died at Nicodemia, his son Constantios who was returned from Mopsucrenae and of Theodosios the Great at Milan.³⁹ In each case, following the closing of the eyes and mouth and arranging of the limbs, the corpse was embalmed to insure protection against decomposition⁴⁰ and readied for the journey home. The body was placed in a rather elaborate gold coffin, which in turn was covered with royal purple. The royally-draped coffin was then placed upon a chariot⁴¹ and escorted back to the capital with the full pomp rendered an emperor during life. John of Damascus describes the manner in which this was done for the emperor Constantios as follows:

The army, having lamented him and having performed the prescribed cares for him, placed him in a coffin after preparing the corpse in the customary manner against decomposition. Placing it upon a chariot they headed for Constantinople, with each one carrying his appropriate weapon. Just as when he was alive all advanced in procession under the leaders.⁴²

A very similar picture is drawn of the translation of Constantine the Great's remains to the capital in the accounts of Eusebios and Socrates respectively, each of these church historians emphasizing that "not a single thing was changed of what was customary" when accompanying the emperor. The historian Zosimos describes similar honors paid to Julian (whose body, however, was not returned to Constantinople) and to Theodosios the Great.⁴³

Priests and bishops singing funerary hymns accompanied the cortège, while the entire procession was met outside the city gates by imperial officials and the lamenting masses.⁴⁴ The dead ruler was then escorted to the palace with full pomp, while the clergy chanted various hymns. That these honors continued to be bestowed upon deceased emperors throughout the one-thousand-year duration of the Byzantine Empire is indicated by an interesting account provided by the thirteenth century historian George Pachymeres. The long-lost body of Emperor Basil II Bulgaroktonos (d. 1025) was discovered during the reign of Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259-1282), and the reigning monarch proceeded to bestow the traditional honors in preparing the corpse, including the pompous reception.⁴⁵ As will be described below, further preparation of the emperor's body for burial took place once it arrived at the palace.

Washing, Anointing, and Wrapping of the Deceased

The custom of washing the corpse with water, wine, a perfumed liquid or other concoctions was common among many ancient cultures.⁴⁶ Thus, precedents for this practice can be seen in the Greek, Roman and Jewish worlds. That this service to the corpse dates back to pre-Homeric Greece is readily concluded from the clear depiction of the washing of the body of Patroklos with warm water. Various literary accounts indicate that the custom was observed throughout the following centuries in antiquity,⁴⁷ and the following words of the satyrist Lucian indicate that the custom continued into the first Christian century: "Then they bathe them (as if the lake down below were not big enough for the people there to bathe in)."⁴⁸

The custom was equally accepted in ancient Rome, with an interesting ramification provided by Servius the Grammarian in his commentary on Virgil. Servius claims that such a washing with warm water was, like the *conclamatio*, a device by which the subject would be awakened if he were not, in fact, dead.⁴⁹

There can be no doubt, as Rush points out,⁵⁰ that the Jews who were converted to Christianity carried over the custom of washing the corpse in Alexandria, Jerusalem and elsewhere. This is clearly indicated by Acts 9:37, where the body of the Jewess Dorcas, a member of the first Christian community of Jerusalem, received this service. Indeed, from the earliest period of their history, and until today, the Jews have observed the custom of washing the corpse, usually with warm water.⁵¹

Among the Byzantines as well, warm water, for the most part, was used in washing the dead. St. Symeon of Thessalonike (d. 1429) in describing proper preparation of the corpse of clerics and laymen alike, says:

Let him who was a hierarch or priest be attended by clerics, that he remain totally sacred; and they shall dress him in clean clothing according to his rank; first, though, they will have washed the body with water alone by means of a sponge in the form of a cross, in the mode of holy baptism, upon the forehead and eyes, the lips and the chest, and also the knees and the hands; . . . likewise also is done for laymen.⁵²

Again, it would appear from an admonition, uttered by Gregory of Nazianzos, that clean water was usually used in the Greek East for this purpose. A popular practice of the day among the Christian faithful was to have catechumens wait until their final

moments before being baptized, thus (they supposed) assuring that they would be without sin when they died. Gregory, admonishing his flock against such an effort to deceive God, says:

Let us be baptized today, that we not rush tomorrow; . . . while you are master of your senses, advance to the gift; . . . while you can become faithful, not in anticipation but confessing; . . . being touched in depth by the grace (of Baptism), and not merely having the body bathed by the burial waters.⁵³

Since, as it appears from the above statement, the water which had been prepared for washing after expiration was also used to baptize the dying person, it follows that this water would need to have been clean and unadulterated. That the water for bathing the corpse was expected to be clean, moreover, is mentioned also by the tenth-century author of saints' lives, Symeon Metaphrastes, who relates that "Domna then bathed the bodies, with clean water, as she had done much earlier with her tears."⁵⁴ As in ancient Greece,⁵⁵ the water which was used was warm when used by the Byzantines for this purpose, as is attested in the seventh-century rendition of the miracles of St. Artemios.⁵⁶

Various biographies of saints, particularly those of ascetics, relate the manner of washing the corpse during the Byzantine centuries, the terminology for this varying between bathing (lousis), washing (plysis), and washing off (apoplysis).⁵⁷ From the very earliest years of the empire, this task had become the responsibility of a burial society which emerged as an immediate result of imperial legislation.⁵⁸ In the ancient world, however, it had been performed by the nearest female relative, preferably wife or mother.⁵⁹ Among the Jews there existed a burial society (Hebrah Kaddisha) which, among other things, took care of the washing of the corpse, or at least from the Talmudic period on.⁶⁰

The Byzantines inherited the mentality of the ancients according to which the corpse was in need of being cleansed of contamination by evil spirits which had brought on sickness and death.⁶¹ This is apparently the reason why in the early centuries of the Byzantine world the entire corpse was bathed with warm water, as may be seen in the life of St. Bartholomeos the Younger.⁶² Further, as concluded by Koukoules, the occasional custom of the Byzantines of using perfumed wines as an agent for washing the corpse, was the result of the same attitude.⁶³ The ancient Greeks as well as the Jews used wine for the same

purpose, with the latter pouring it before the corpse rather than washing it with it.⁶⁴

The anointing of the deceased's body with expensive myrrh was, from the very earliest years of Christianity, related to this desire to combat the effect of decomposition.⁶⁵ As attested in the apocryphal Acts of Peter, such was the practice of the Apostolic Church, and is alluded to by Jesus also, Who was Himself anointed according to Jewish customs following His death.⁶⁶ That such perfumes were used during the first century A.D. to combat the odor of death is clearly witnessed in the following words of Lucian: ". . . and after anointing with the finest perfume the body which is already hasting to corruption . . . they lay it in state . . ."⁶⁷ The earliest Church Fathers (in some instances mentioning the excessive expense involved) also bear witness to this custom, as do accounts in saints' lives of the pre-Byzantine Christian era.⁶⁸

The custom of anointing the corpse in this manner is mentioned by early Byzantine writers and continues to be attested until the fall of the empire in the fifteenth century. A pseudo-Athanasian work of the fourth century mentions that use was made of aloes, smyrna and other spices mixed with wine for bathing the corpse.⁶⁹ Similar references are made to this custom in the next few centuries by a number of the Church Fathers. Gregory of Nyssa, preaching a eulogy upon the death and burial of the Antiochean bishop Meletios (d. 381), says the following:

. . . Instead of those things, what do we have? — It's difficult to talk about it! — Clean sheets, silk clothes, plenty of myrrh and perfume, the tribute of a woman who is modest and proper . . .⁷⁰

Another apt example, as cited by Rush, is taken from Chrysostom. Clearly assuming that his audience is aware of the custom of such an anointing of the corpse, he says in his commentary on the evangelist John's account of Jesus' burial:

Joseph, therefore, coming forward, asks a favor of Pilate, and he grants it. For what should cause him not to? And Nicodemus helps him, and provides a costly burial. For they still looked upon him as a mere man. And they bring forth such spices, which had the special nature of preserving the body for a long time and of not allowing it to be given swiftly over to corruption; . . .⁷¹

And centuries later, we find John of Damascus relating an event

which includes information about the performance of this very custom. Writing about the burial of the martyr and miracle-worker Artemios (d. 361), Monachos says:

A faithful woman by the name of Ariste, being a deaconess of the Church of Antioch, requested his blessed and holy body from the king Julian; and he permitted it be given to her; and she made a box, and anointing his holy and blessed body, and perfuming (it) with expensive spices and fragrances, placed it in the box and dispatched it to the most joyous city of Constantine; . . .⁷²

Nor are the biographies of various other Byzantine saints lacking in informative narratives which mention this custom. For example, Symeon Metaphrastes tells how abbas Marinos was discovered upon death to be a woman (and subsequently renamed Marina), and describes the anointing of the corpse as follows: "And the brethren, taking up the body of the Blessed Marina, anointed it and placed it in a simple location with every care."⁷³ The same biographer relates how the body of the martyr Charitina was washed up on the opposite shore after having been thrown into the sea by her persecutors, from which it was retrieved by one Claudius. He, being a believer, "anointing her splendidly and wrapping her more appropriately, placed her in an honorable place . . ."⁷⁴ The strong, traditional adherence of the Byzantines to this custom is pointed up by this last account, for even in time of persecution when one would chance the wrath of the persecutors for having rendered such cares to the martyrs, time and effort are spent to perform the anointing. Thus, one concludes, a custom which originally had a very practical purpose, by the late Byzantine centuries had evolved in the minds of the people to become, in addition, an indispensable tribute to the dead. The custom continues to appear in similar biographies written in the eighth through tenth centuries. For example, the corpse of St. George, bishop of Lesbos (d. 844), was accompanied to its burial site in the Church of the Virgin by "persons carrying candles, psalms and myrrhs," that of the tenth century female martyr Theodota was completely anointed "with perfumed oils," and the body of St. Luke the new Stylite, another tenth century saint, was placed in a coffin, "being anointed, as was proper, with myrrhs of many kinds."⁷⁵

Justinian's Digest includes legislation relevant to the custom of anointing the corpse, which provides that cost of the funeral,

including ointments, is to be paid as an honor fitting the dead.⁷⁶

The corpus of Church law also includes a twelfth century allusion to this practice in the canonical questions asked by the Patriarch Markos of Alexandria (d. 1174), which are responded to by the canonist Patriarch of Antioch, Theodore Balsamon (d. 1199). Markos reminds the Antiochean hierarch of the ancient Alexandrian practice of anointing deceased bishops and other clergy with Holy Myrrh (i.e. Chrismation Oil), and asks if this is proper. Balsamon explains that in any case such a practice is uncanonical, for such myrrh is consecrated for use only at baptism.⁷⁷ This discussion would seem to indicate that anointing of the corpse with perfumed oils in general was also a common practice in later Byzantine history. Although the practice of using Chrismation myrrh for this purpose has long ceased in the Eastern Orthodox world, in modern Greece common wine, perfume or rose-water is applied to the corpse. It would seem that this practice is a remnant of the Byzantine custom of anointing the deceased's body with expensive myrrhs.⁷⁸

The notion that it is dishonorable to bury the dead naked survives from pre-Christian times, and was found among the Greeks, Romans and Jews.⁷⁹ This custom was continued into the early Christian era, and, as Rush points out, the burial clothing could vary from a simple, white linen covering to the most elaborate garb.⁸⁰ The use of linen by the Byzantines as a shroud or a burial swaddling-cloth—a practice most probably introduced to the Christian community by the Jews⁸¹—is that which immediately concerns us at this point.

The use of linen either as the simplest and only burial garb or as a basic covering prior to more elaborate robing was a Byzantine custom widely attested in the literary sources. The process of wrapping the corpse with linen was referred to by the terms *lazaroma*⁸² or *savanoma*.⁸³ The corpse was swaddled in a burial shroud which was prepared by the immediate family⁸⁴ and was made of long strips of white linen. These linen cloths were usually called *othonal* (linens), *sindones* (sheets), *anavolaion* (outer-garment) and especially *spargana epitaphia* or *spargana entaphia* (burial-swaddling clothes).⁸⁵ A rather clear picture of the corpse swaddled in this manner is found in Chrysostom's comparison of a living person who is spiritually dead to a bound and restricted corpse.⁸⁶ Here and in similar passages,⁸⁷ we learn that the hands were tied to the stomach or chest with what appear to have been

thongs or simple cords, and the feet were similarly bound. This custom, practiced by ancient Greeks, Romans and Jews, and continued today in parts of Greece,⁸⁸ is met in the life of St. Theodora of Thessalonica, composed at the end of the ninth century by Gregory the Cleric. In the separate account of the translation of the relics of Theodora, the biographer records that when the coffin was opened her remains were found to be perfectly intact, "and the cord which tied her hands to the breast was likewise intact and had been preserved unharmed."⁸⁹ The opinion has been advanced by some that the tight wrapping of the corpse with the burial linen was for the purpose of preserving it at least for the duration of the prothesis or lying-in-state, particularly among the wealthy class.⁹⁰

Although such a formal wrapping of the body was the common practice of the Byzantines, it is certainly to be assumed that there were occasions when circumstances would not allow it. On the other hand, in monastic communities the systematic wrapping of the corpse might well have been dispensed with as being unnecessary. Thus of the fifth century saint, Melania, we read: "She received no linen, save the sheet which we placed above her."⁹¹

The task of wrapping the corpse was entrusted in Byzantium to women known as *kopiatai*. We shall see in the next section that it was these women who also dressed and adorned the deceased.

Dressing and Adorning of the Deceased

After the wrapping of the body, the *kopiatai* prepared the corpse for the prothesis, or lying-in-state, by dressing and adorning it.⁹³ Indeed, it was here that the Byzantines tended to go to the extreme in showing honor to their dead. This tendency, however, was not uniquely Byzantine. Lucian provides information which indicates that this custom was observed by the Greek pagans of the first century A.D., and Aelian indicates that it is still the normal practice in the Roman world some one hundred years later.⁹⁴ As Loukatos mentions, this custom reached its height in the Roman Empire, where funerals became the show-place of family wealth and fame. As will be seen below, such honors were likewise a distinctive feature of burials among the wealthy classes in the Byzantine Empire, and as early as the fourth century incurred the wrath of the Church Fathers.

Even the lowliest Byzantine classes made every effort to garb their dead in their finest and newest clothing, and usually in

white. Chrysostom, describing the plight of parents at the death-bed of their son, tells us that once the child dies, among other things, they "dress him in fine grave-clothes."⁹⁵ The same Church Father, in offering consolation to the bereaved and assuring them that the values of this world are not those of the next, says:

. . . at that place, where we shall all appear naked, slaves and freemen, nobles and men of no repute, sinners and just, rich and poor . . . he who is dressed in silken garments here before us shall appear naked there.⁹⁶

That such a custom manifests the desire to honor the dead is evident in the admonishing words of Chrysostom to his flock:

Many times you adorn the unfeeling body—which is no longer aware of the honor—with many, varied and gilded garments; however, you overlook that body which is suffering, bruised, tortured and strained from famine and pestilence . . .⁹⁷

Chrysostom's mention of "gilded garments" in the above quotation is not an exaggeration. Abundant use was made of silk and gold-metallic materials by the Byzantines for clothing the dead. Our most informative source for this custom are the Church Fathers themselves, whose pleas for moderation in this matter obviously fell on deaf ears. Basil the Great chides the wealthy for their foolishness, saying that they would not consider serving left-over food to their honored guests but readily offer, in the form of a richly garbed corpse, the remnants of a person's life to God. "It is tasteless to bedeck the corpse and richly to adorn him who no longer has any feeling."⁹⁸ Chrysostom similarly admonishes his audience against the garbing of the dead with rich and ornate silks and metallic cloth:

Don't tell me about him who is carried on a golden cot, who is led out by the entire populace of the city, who is praised by the masses, who wears silk and gilded clothes so richly piled on; for, this is no different than serving a generous meal to a worm.⁹⁹

That elaborate and rich garbing of the dead had reached extremes among the wealthy class in Byzantium is clearly indicated. The robbing of the graves of wealthy families became an increasingly common practice. The monastic wanderer of the late sixth century, John Moschos, tells in his memoirs of the confession of a man who had robbed such a grave. The culprit, needing money and having seen the funeral procession of a richly

clothed man, was robbing the grave when the dead man suddenly came to life and plucked out the robber's eyes.¹⁰⁰ The temptation for robbery thus became another ready argument of the Church Fathers against lavish dressing of the deceased.¹⁰¹ Further, the ostentation evident in this custom became a matter of concern to some of the wealthy, who requested that they not be dressed so lavishly when they die. Gregory of Nyssa provides us with such a request made by St. Ephraim the Syrian (d. 379):

As this 'God-bearing' man was preparing to be lifted up to heaven, he requested those present not to bury him in a rich garment . . . Thus, one of those standing near by, who himself was brilliantly dressed, hearing the request decided to give to the poor the rich raiment which he had bought earlier for the purpose of clothing the holy man . . .¹⁰²

Although the display of wealth may have reached distasteful extremes among the rich, the primary purpose of the Byzantine upper-class was not simply for show. Rather, it wanted to honor its dead with the very best at hand. Indeed, this desire is evident among all the classes in Byzantine society, clerical as well as lay. The bishops themselves, who criticized the use of silks and cloths of gold, were buried in their finest liturgical vestments. And monks were buried in their finest garb, humble perhaps in comparison to the rich garments of the wealthy laymen, but nevertheless the finest of their worldly possessions.

In the fifteenth century, Symeon of Thessalonica clearly states in his rubrics concerning the burial of the dead that hierarchs and priests are to be buried wearing their vestments, a custom continued until today in the Orthodox world. This practice can be traced back to the middle and early Byzantine periods. For example, the body of the tenth century saint Arsenios, a monk in the brotherhood of the abbot Elias Spelaiotes, was dug up by the invading Saracens and discovered to be dressed in vestments. After the infidels had departed, Abbas Elias proceeded to re-bury the corpse still dressed in the vestments. Likewise, the body of St. Melania of the fifth century was garbed in her monastic robes, as was also St. Ephraim the Syrian.¹⁰³

In any case, the initial motivation for the practice of dressing the deceased in the newest and finest clothing available was the love or esteem for the bereaved, and this was not overlooked by the Church Fathers despite their strict attitude against unnecessary ostentation.¹⁰⁴

The clothing of the deceased in the Byzantine Empire was almost always white (as was the linen swaddling-cloth), the outstanding exception being the garb of dead slaves and those who died while in mourning.¹⁰⁵ This preference for white, which is also found among the Greeks, Romans and Jews of antiquity,¹⁰⁶ came from the notion that the corpse must be kept pure. From antiquity on, white clothing has represented purity, and the Byzantines also felt that the washed, anointed and cleanly wrapped corpse should be dressed in the finest white clothes so that its purity might be preserved. Thus, in the account by Symeon Metaphrastes, we see the late third-century saint Domna dressing the bodies of the martyrs with "new sheets, white outfits, and additional myrrhs and incenses."¹⁰⁷ A remnant of this custom in modern Greece appears to be the practice of dressing the corpse of young girls and recently married persons in white burial clothes.¹⁰⁸

The dressing of the corpse in Byzantium was completed by placing sandals upon the feet and a covering upon the head. Alluding to the common notion among the Byzantines that the corpse would have to make a journey to the after-life, the biographer of the sixth century saint Daniel of Skete says that in those graves from which the corpses had risen to life, only the burial clothes and sandals remained.¹⁰⁹ The custom of covering the head with a handkerchief-like cloth is mentioned in a number of saints' lives, such as those of the fifth century saint Melania or the fourth century Capadocian saint, Makrina.¹¹⁰

These were the usual customs of the Byzantines pertaining to the dressing of the deceased. There were, to be sure, exceptions, but most of them can be explained by particular circumstances; for example, a dead bride would be buried wearing her bridal gown and all appropriate adornments.¹¹¹

Special measures were taken in dressing the corpse of an emperor or an empress. This task was the responsibility of the imperial wardrobe servants, the *vestosakranoi*.¹¹² After the body of an emperor or a member of his family had received the first cares, including the washing, anointing and wrapping, it was mourned by the imperial family together with the most intimate palace servants. The gathering of the family began as the dying member breathed his last; and after his death, the bereaved remained with the corpse, which then received the initial cares. This private mourning lasted approximately six hours, and was

held in a private chamber called the *tetrapylon* or *tetravelon* with the curtains drawn to insure protection from curious eyes.¹¹³ This scene is described clearly upon the death of Constantine the Great, and is mentioned also by Gregory of Nyssa in his homily on the death of the princess Pulcheria.¹¹⁴ The miniatures in a manuscript of the chronicle by the eleventh-century Byzantine historian John Scylitzes indicate that this custom of private mourning was continued through the Amorian and Macedonian dynasties of the ninth through eleventh centuries.¹¹⁵

Every attempt was made in Byzantium to render honor to a dead emperor as though he were still alive. This began from the moment of his death, and was the custom even if, as we saw above, his body needed to be transferred back to the capital. In the palace the corpse of the emperor or indeed of any member of the imperial family was dressed in a most elaborate fashion. The emperor's body was adorned with full regalia, as if he were still alive and preparing to attend a state function.¹¹⁶

The regalia with which an emperor was buried included the *divetesion* (gold-knitted surplice, *auroclavum*), the diadem and the imperial mantle. Both Eusebios of Caesarea and Socrates state that these were placed upon the corpse of Constantine the Great.¹¹⁷ The *divetesion*, which was worn by the emperor at all official functions, could be quite ornate or very simple.¹¹⁸ Upon death, however, the richest *divetesion* was worn by the deceased monarch. The author of the reign of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos (1261-1282), George Pachymeres, notes that after the body of the long-dead Emperor Basil II the Bulgar Slayer was discovered, it was garbed in silk and golden garments.¹¹⁹ That the most elaborate surplice and mantle were to be used in burying an emperor is prescribed by Constantine VII in his work on ceremonial customs, where he says:

The corpse is removed by the cavalry, and the gold coffin (called "sorrow") is placed in the hall of the nineteen couches, and the corpse is laid out there, garbed in a surplice, a gold mantle, and military shoes.¹²⁰

The corpse of an empress was likewise dressed with elaborate clothing studded with gold and pearls, and her shoes were covered with precious stones.¹²¹

An indication that this manifestation of esteem to a dead emperor was continued to the end of the Byzantine Empire is found in the work of the fifteenth-century poet Vizentzos

Kornaros. The poet describes the funeral of the king's nephew, Aristes, and points out that his head is crowned with a golden diadem.¹²²

The Byzantines also added additional ornamentation in order to adorn and honor the dead. Thus, it was not unusual for them to use the hair of another person to enhance the appearance of a dead female. This practice (which had precedents in antiquity as well) was customary in the earliest Christian communities and was frowned upon by the fathers of the Church.¹²³ The Byzantines especially liked to drape long, blond hair over the side of the coffin, a custom which lasted among the Greeks until the seventeenth century.¹²⁴

Finally, the head of the deceased was crowned with a wreath of flowers. Symeon Metaphrastes indicates that this was done to all the dead as an accepted custom, and Gregory of Nyssa alludes to the same practice in mentioning that his sister Makrina was dressed as a bride with a covering on her head.¹²⁵ The same custom is indicated in literature of the late Byzantine period, and is found in modern Greek practice as well, the head of an unmarried person being crowned with a floral wreath.¹²⁶ There is no doubt that the Byzantines continued this custom from the ancient Greeks and Romans, where it was closely associated with the customary marriage wreaths.¹²⁷ As Blümner mentions, it seems that the ancients replaced the wreath of flowers or garlands with one of beaten gold leaf, and many such wreaths have been discovered by archeologists.¹²⁸ Despite the popularity of this custom in Byzantium, it was nevertheless censured by the early Church Fathers as being of pagan origin.¹²⁹

The Prothesis or Lying-in-State

The term **prothesis** was used by the Byzantines to denote the laying-out of the body for viewing. This custom was practiced in antiquity by the Greeks and Romans, who laid out the body immediately outside the entrance to the house.¹³⁰ A statement by Chrysostom indicates that this was also the practice of the fourth-century Byzantine Christians, and it likewise appears to have been the case in later centuries of the empire.¹³¹ This practice left adequate room in the house for the numerous friends and relatives to congregate to pay their last respects to the deceased and to offer condolences to the bereaved. That such visitations occurred and, to be sure, were expected is attested in numerous

saints' lives of the early, middle and late periods of the Byzantine Empire. For example, the writer of the life of the tenth-century saint Basil the Younger writes:

As his holy corpse lay in state and was being praised with hymns and final songs, the flowing masses of the faithful looked on in hopes of being blessed by the sight of him.

Likewise, it is clearly implied that the monastic community anticipated the faithful paying their respects to the fourth-century saint Febronia:

. . . having washed the holy corpse they placed it upon a bed . . . and Briena [the abbess] ordered the doors to be opened to the crowds. And the masses entered and offered glory to God.

Similar accounts are found in the life of Saint Tikhon (seventh century) and others.¹³²

Whereas the prothesis of a layman took place in his home and that of a monk in the confines of his monastery, a priest or bishop was usually laid out in the church in order to provide adequate space for the crowds of faithful. As we saw above, the prothesis of the nun Febronia took place in her convent; and that of the legendary saint Theodora of Alexandria was likewise located in a monastery chapel.¹³³

The prothesis was arranged so that the head of the corpse faced the East. The explicit reason for this has varied over the centuries since antiquity, but is doubtless associated with the custom of facing the East for prayer or some other religious act.¹³⁴ Christians, for example, like the Jews believe that the Biblical Paradise lies in the East.¹³⁵ Modern Greeks advance various theories to explain the custom of laying the deceased out so that he faces the East. These include the rationalizations that "the sun rises in the East," "one blesses himself while facing the East," and "the Holy Sepulchre is in the East."¹³⁶ The Church Fathers explain this in a way which was, to be sure, more theologically sophisticated than the explanations of the laity. Chrysostom, for example, associates the custom with the doctrine of soteriology when he says: "We arrange the coffin so that it faces the East, indicating in this way the coming resurrection." St. Makrina, sister of Gregory of Nyssa and Basil the Great, fully arranged her own body at the moment of death. She further had her death-bed turned toward the East so that she could utter her last prayers facing God and be looking toward Him in death.¹³⁷ Whatever the underlying reason, the

Byzantines turned the body toward the East when death approached, during the prothesis and in the grave; and this is still the practice in many areas of modern Greece.¹³⁸

The body of a lay person, including monks who were not ordained clerics and nuns, was laid out in a prone position, perhaps with a pillow under the head and with the face uncovered.¹³⁹ On the other hand, it was customary in Byzantium to bury both bishops and priests in a sitting position. Athanasios the Great implies that this custom existed among the Alexandrian Christians of his day. Furthermore, it remains the practice in many areas of modern Greece.¹⁴⁰

The corpse reclined either in a casket (**pheretron**) or on a bed (**kline**) which was elevated on a pedestal (**vathron**).¹⁴¹ This elevation of the casket served the practical purpose of allowing all in attendance to view the deceased, which, according to Lucian, was the reason why the ancients used a pedestal. This custom is popular among most people today, including the modern Greeks.¹⁴²

As mentioned earlier, the hands of the deceased were crossed and tied to the breast or midriff during the wrapping, and this is the way they remained during the prothesis. The crossing of the hands was a symbolic act, performed by monks and others in many instances as death approached. As we likewise saw above, this occurred in the cases of Saint Makrina and Saint Melania in the fourth and fifth centuries respectively, and the hands of saint Theodora, which were found to be still bound together when her relics were discovered, attest to this custom in the ninth century as well. Likewise, the seventy-five year old abbot of the Studion, Nicholas (d. c899) “. . . folding his hands in the form of the Cross, without hesitation gave up his soul to the angels, who lifted it away . . .”¹⁴³

The Byzantines placed an icon upon the crossed hands of a layman during the prothesis, a custom which is continued by modern Greeks. In his rubrics, Symeon of Thessalonike comments that an icon is to be set upon the hands, explaining:

And they shall place upon him an icon of Him Whom he loved . . . The icon is placed because of his faith in Christ, and because he gave up his soul to Him.¹⁴⁴

The same Church Father goes on to say that “upon a monk they are to place a Psalter, which is still done by many . . . ,¹⁴⁵ and for a priest or bishop he prescribes the following:

Upon the hands (of a cleric) they shall set the Gospel, which should first be read over him as he is dying, if time permits, or after death. This is done because he lived according to the Bible, and also to secure his atonement and blessing by the most holy words. For what can be more pleasing to God than the reading of these words?¹⁴⁶

In addition, the Byzantines placed the Holy Eucharist in the hands of a dead bishop, as was permitted by the Church canons. This custom, like those enumerated above, is still part of the liturgical practice of the Orthodox Church today.¹⁴⁷

By the raised coffin, either at each end or around it, the Byzantines placed tapers or candles in the Roman tradition. An allusion to this custom is found in the life of the ninth-century defender of the icons, Abbot Theodore of Studion (d. 826):

. . . at about the sixth hour when he felt himself weakening, he ordered that some candles be lit to provide a dim light; and thus, as the brothers began chanting the funerary hymn . . . he gave up his blessed soul . . .¹⁴⁸

Symeon Metaphrastes clearly indicates the ecclesiastical custom of placing candles as well as incense by the coffin, when he says in his biography of Saint Cornelius the Centurian:

After it had become evening, the bishop prayed and ordered that the clergy sing an all-night vigil. And they honored the casket [i.e. the deceased] through the night with hymns, candles and incense.¹⁴⁹

As mentioned above, the mouth was kept shut by passing a cord or ribbon beneath the jaw and tying it on top of the head. This custom, as we have shown, existed in antiquity and is still practiced in modern Greece, where a colored kerchief is used for this purpose.¹⁵⁰ As with many other customs inherited from the ancients, the Byzantines attached a romantic or heroic commentary to this one. It seems, as Koukoules points out, that the notion that the jaw of a bishop is tied with a fine, silk cloth in memory or honor of the iconophile patriarch of Constantinople, Methodios (842-847), has been a popular one since the ninth century. This defender of the holy images had his jaw disjointed for his having been so outspoken during the reign of Emperor Theophilos (829-842).¹⁵¹ However, we know that the custom was practiced among the early Christians, and that it appears in literature of the early Byzantine period as well. An example is found, aptly depicted, in the life of the sixth century bishop of

Asia Minor, Nicholas.¹⁵²

Whether the ancient Greek and Roman custom of placing a coin in the deceased's mouth was widely practiced by the Byzantines is debatable, though Lucian provides us with evidence that it survived among the pagans until at least the second Christian century.¹⁵³ According to the ancient notion, this coin, which was placed in the mouth immediately following death and was called *danake* or *ovulus*, represented payment to Charon, the ferryman who transported the body across the Styx.¹⁵⁴ Koukoules has called attention to the fact that a number of these coins have been found in Byzantine graves; nevertheless, in view of the silence of the literary sources on the matter it is difficult to argue that this was more than a sporadic custom in Byzantium. Moreover, the placing of this coin in the mouth or hand of the deceased by the modern Greeks is not sufficiently popular to indicate that it was widely practiced by the Byzantines.¹⁵⁵

The prothesis of the corpse of a Byzantine emperor, as depicted in chronicles and biographies, was an occasion of great solemnity. After the six-hour period of private, family mourning discussed above, the imperial coffin, called the "couch of sorrow" was laid out in the Hall of the Nineteen Couches. This chamber (commonly used as a dining hall) was located in the center of Daphne Palace, the site within the Great Palace complex of Constantinople where the most solemn affairs of state were staged.¹⁵⁶ The coffin was a very ornate and obviously expensive item: The caskets of the emperor Constantine the Great and of the fourth century princess Pulcheria were said to have been made out of gold. The emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (d. 959), in his work on imperial protocol, also leads one to believe that the coffin was made of solid gold: "... and the gold bed [i.e. coffin], which is called 'sorrow,' is placed in the Hall of the Nineteen Couches."¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, the continuators of Theophanes' chronicles tell us that the coffin of Constantine VII himself was gold-plated.¹⁵⁸ It is quite likely, moreover, that the imperial coffin was customarily studded with pearls and precious stones, since Gregory of Nyssa mentions that this honor was paid to princess Pulcheria.¹⁵⁹

The emperor's coffin was likewise elevated on a pedestal while lying in state in the Daphne Palace and was surrounded by burning candles.¹⁶⁰ The candles usually rested on gold candelabra, as is attested for the prothesis of Constantine the Great and the

sainted empress Theophano (d. 897), the first wife of Leo VI (886-912).¹⁶¹

Before the corpse of the emperor was removed from the Hall of Nineteen Couches, there took place a ritual which may well have been a remnant of the ancient *conclamatio*. After all of the officially garbed senators and other dignitaries had paid their respects, the emperor's chief eunuch signaled the master of ceremonies to begin the procession to the Chalke.¹⁶² The master of ceremonies in a loud voice then cried out three times, "Depart Emperor; the King of Kings, Lord of Lords calls you." The same ritual was repeated as the cortège left the Chalke and at the gravesite (i.e. the Church of the Holy Apostles), though here he intoned: "Enter Emperor; the King of Kings, Lord of Lords calls you."¹⁶³

The matter of emperor-worship in Byzantium is raised by a comment made by the tenth-century emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitos in his description of the death of Emperor Zeno (d. 491). Before the departure from the Hall of the Nineteen Couches, says Constantine VII, "the chamber-servants (*vestosakranoi*), artists and mint-masters (*monetarioi*) performed what was customary." Apparently the last two drew images of the deceased monarch, in preparation for painting a permanent portrait and for issuing of coins. The Roman custom of issuing such coins as a manifestation of an emperor's deification ceased, in the opinion of some, with the reign of either Constantine the Great (d. 337), Theodosios the Great (d. 395) or Theodosios II (d. 450). However, there is evidence to indicate that the images of emperors appeared on coins until the end of the iconoclastic controversy in the ninth century; this practice, however, is not to be associated with the earlier notion of deification. Such being the case, it is obvious that Constantine VII is speaking not of a contemporary (10th century) custom, but of one of the late fifth century, namely at the time when Zeno died. Moreover, it has been argued that even if the exclamation "Enter emperor; the King of Kings, Lord of Lords calls you" is connected with the custom of image-drawing at the time of Zeno's death, still it is only possible to assume that deification of the Byzantine emperor lasted at most to the reign of Anastasios (491-518).¹⁶⁴

Conclusion

In the preceding pages we have explained in detail the major steps which the Byzantines took in caring for their dead from the moment of death to the lying-in-state. These Byzantine customs were, as we have seen, many and varied. To be sure, they did not develop over-night. There is a long and complex background behind them. First of all, there can be noticed a concern for the dead inherited from the ancient Greeks, who were more than a little anxious about the fate of the psyche once it entered the abyss beyond the grave. Second, the influence of Rome, both republican and imperial, is unmistakably present in the Byzantine tendency toward ostentation. Third, the customs of ancient Israel left their mark here, customs which came to Byzantium via the conversion of the Jews to Christianity in the eastern half of the Mediterranean world. Finally, the new and unique outlook of Christianity on the subject of death contributed its own share to the Byzantine customs. One needs to be cautious, however, in evaluating this last influence. That the Christian mentality was a prime contributor in the development of burial customs in monastic communities is readily evident in various saints' lives. On the other hand, Christian teaching did not influence the practices of Byzantine society as a whole to the extent that one would expect and the Church Fathers would have preferred.

The Byzantines did not take over these burial customs without making some changes, nor once they had done so did these practices remain stagnant: they were developed and modified over the one-thousand year history of the Byzantine Empire. As the Byzantines became more sophisticated and knowledgeable, as they freed themselves of ancient mystery-cloaked notions, their customs regarding the care of the dead also underwent transition. Furthermore, we must also deal with the possibility that exposure to new, different and barbaric peoples who bordered on the empire and periodically penetrated it may have exerted some influence on these customs over the centuries.

Our study has been limited to the cares taken for the deceased from death to the **prothesis**. There remain other aspects which need to be studied if we are ever to obtain a full understanding of the history and rationale of Byzantine burial customs. The cares taken for a person approaching death and the practices which

sought to induce a blissful repose of the soul need to be investigated. Moreover, a careful study of Byzantine mourning customs will abundantly contribute to a more thorough understanding of the over-all topic. To be sure, the Byzantines, like the ancient Greeks, were extremists in this matter. Tearing the hair, beating the chest and head with fists and stones, raking one's fingernails over the breasts and cheeks to the point of drawing blood, dirge-singing, beating the head on the ground—all of these contributed to the Byzantine way of mourning the dead. It was here particularly that the Church Fathers spoke out with vigor, but with obvious failure.

Byzantine history has too often been depicted as an unending tide of court intrigue, empty pomp and cultural stagnation; but a study of Byzantine burial customs, even one as brief as ours, points up the fact that the Byzantines were colorful and intensely spiritual people, conscious of the fragility of life and deeply concerned for their dead.

NOTES

1. Recent works in this area include: Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (H. H. Scullard, ed., *Aspects of Greek and Roman Life*) (Ithaca, N.Y., 1971); J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1971); Eric M. Myers, *Jewish Ossuaries: Reburial and Rebirth*. *Biblica et Orientalia*, No. 24 (Rome, 1971); Dov. Zlotnick, *The Tractate "Mourning"* (Vol. XVII, Leon Nemoy, ed., *Yale Judaica Series*) (New Haven, 1966); Alfred C. Rush, *Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity* (Vol. I, Johannes Quasten, ed., *Studies in Christian Antiquity* (Washington, 1941); Konstantinos Kallinikos, «Ἡ Φροντὶς τῶν νεκρῶν ἐν τῷ Χριστιανισμῷ,» *Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ Κλήρου*, IV (1914), 200-05, 240-45, 280-85, 358-63, 395-99.
2. Demetrios A. Petrakakos, *Die Toten em Recht nach des Lehre und der Normen des Orthodoxen morgenländischen Kirchenrechts* (Leipzig, 1905). Jean Ebersolt, "Sarcophages impériaux de Rome et de Constantinople," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXX (1929-1930), 582-587. Jean Ebersolt, *Mission archéologique de Constantinople* (Paris, 1921).
3. Phaidon Koukoules, ««Βυζαντινῶν Νεκρικὰ Ἔθιμα,»," *EEBS*, XVI (1940), 3-80 and «Τὰ κατὰ τὴν ταφὴν τῶν Βυζαντινῶν Βασιλέων,» *EEBS*, XV (1939), 52-78. Demetrios S. Loukatos, «Λαογραφικαὶ περὶ τελευτῆς ἐνδείξεις παρὰ Ἰωάννη τῷ Χρυσοστόμῳ,» *II* (1940), 30-117. Georgios K. Spyridakes, «Τὰ κατὰ τὴν τελευταίαν ἔθιμα τῶν Βυζαντινῶν Ἀγιολογικῶν Πηγῶν,» *EEBS*, XX (1950), 74-171.

4. B. Schmidt, "Totengebräuche und Gräberkultus im heutigen Griechenland," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXIV (1926), 281-318, XXV (1927), 52-82. Nikolaos Polites, *Λογογραφία Σύμμεικτα*, 3 vols. (Athens, 1920-1931).
5. "De Ordine Sepulture," PG, CLV, 669-696. Loukatos, *Ἐνθεάζεις*, has made an extremely helpful collection of allusions to the subject of death in the writings of John Chrysostom.
6. Theophanes Confessor, *Chronographia*, 2 vols. Ed. by Carl de Boor (Leipzig, 1883). Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, CSHB. George Pachymeres, *De Michael et Andronico Paleologis*, CSHB.
7. For a discussion of these three periods see Spyridakes, *Ἐθιμα*, 76-78.
8. Joseph Viteau (ed.), *Passions des saints Ecaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie, Barbara et Anyisia* (Paris, 1897), p. 81.
9. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," ed. by Virginia W. Callahan in *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, 9 vols. Ed. by Werner Jaeger (Leiden, 1952-1967), VIII, Pt. I, 396.
10. Hermann Usener (ed.), *Legenden der heiligen Pelagia* (Bonn, 1879), p. 15; "Acta S. Febroniae," AS, XXVII, 28.
11. Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 41. This act was called the *depositio*, and among the Romans it took place when death appeared imminent. It is to be noted that there is no evidence of a formal utterance of the *conclamatio* (i.e., the calling of the deceased's name one, three or more times to confirm death) in the Byzantine world as it was known in the Roman Empire and earlier. Abraham I. Shinedling, "Burial and Burial Customs," *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, II, 595, Pl. 598.
12. Ch. Lécivain, "Funus (Grece)," *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, II, 1369, 1371, Fig. 3332; A. Mau, "Bestattung," *Real-Encyclopädia der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. New edition, III, 334.
13. Homer *Odyssey* 11.426, 24.296, *Iliad* 11.452-453.
14. Charalampos Voulodemos, *Δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ Ἰδιωτικοῦ Βίου τῶν Ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων*. 2 vols. Ed. by Emmanouel Voutzina (Athens, 1875-1903), II, 363-364; Polites, *Σύμμεικτα*, III, 325 n. 7.
15. Hugo Blümner, *Die Römischen Privataltertümer* (Vol. IV, Pt. II, Iwan von Miller, ed., *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*) (Munich, 1911), p. 483; Polites, *Σύμμεικτα*, III, 325 n. 8. Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 44; Rush, *Antiquity*, p. 106.
16. Gen. 46:4. See Shinedling, "Burial Customs," 595; Zlotnick, *Mourning*, pp. 18, 31, 97 and 98 nn. 2 and 4.
17. Theophanes Continuatus, CSHB, p. 548.
18. John Mavrogordatos (ed.), *Digenes Akritas* (Oxford, 1956), p. 224.
19. W. Caland, "Die vorchristlichen baltischen Totengebräuche," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XVII (1914), 496-497; Ioannes Protodikos, *Περὶ τῆς πρὸ ἡμῶν τρυφῆς* (Athens, 1860), pp. 11, 19.
20. Chrysostom, "In Paralyticum demissum per tectum," PG, LI, 62.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Spyridakes, *Ἐθιμα*, 103.

23. Leon Clugnet (ed.), *Vie de l'Abbé Daniel le Scétiote (VI^e siècle)* (Paris, 1901) (Part of *Bibliothèque hagiographique grecque*), p. 3. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 398, where it is stated that Gregory's sister, St. Macrina, upon expectation of death applied the sign of the cross upon her eyes, mouth and heart.
24. Chrysostom, "De Coemeterio et Cruce," *PG*, XLIX, 396-397.
25. Andreas Phytrakes, *Τὰ ἱερώδη τοῦ Μοναχικοῦ Βίου κατὰ τὴν Δ' μ.-χ. αἰῶνα ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τῶν ἀγιολογικῶν πηγῶν* (Athens, 1945), pp. 34-36. It is widely known that Athonite monks continue this custom today. In addition, they make the sign of the cross over their mouth each time they yawn. I have on numerous occasions witnessed these acts in the company of such monks.
26. The matter of the tying of the jaw will be discussed in detail in the final section, as will also be the custom of placing a coin in the mouth of the deceased.
27. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 399.
28. Eusebios *Ecclesiastical History*, 7.22.9. By "bodies of the saints," Dionysios is referring to the Christians who had died in the plague, for it was quite common to speak of the communicants of the Church as "saints."
29. Theodore Prodromos, «Στίχοι Μοναδικοί ἐκ προσώπου τῆς Σεβαστοκρατορίας ἐπὶ τῷ ταύτης ὁμόφυγι», in *Anecdota Nova*. Ed. by Jo. Franc. Boissonade (Paris, 1844), p. 383.
30. See Chrysostom, "In Paralyticum demissum per tectum," *PG*, LI, 62; Chrysostom, "In Epistolam ad Philippenses," *PG*, LXII, 242; Chrysostom, "Ad populum Antiochenum," *PG*, XLIX, 212; Gregory Nazianzenos, "De Seipso," *PG*, XXXVII, 1347; Symeon Metaphrastes, "Martyrium S. Sebastiani," *PG*, CXVI, 796; *Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi*. Ed. by P. R. Coleman-Norton (Cambridge, 1928), p. 127; Jean Maspero (ed.), *Papyrus Grecs d'époque byzantine*, 3 vols. (Lecaire, 1911-1916), I, 302. II, 182; Aug. Heisenberg (ed.), *Nicephori Blemmydae, curriculum vitae et carmina* (Leipzig, 1896), p. 329; H. Delehaye (ed.), "Une vie inédite de saint Jean d'Aumônier," *AB*, XLV (1927), 53; Gustav Anrich (ed.), *Hagios Nikolaos: Der heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1913-1917), I, 53-54. See also Loukatos, *Ἐνδεΐξεις*, 46; Kallinikos, *Θρονεὶς τῶν νεκρῶν*, 200-01; Koukoules, *Ἐνυμολογία εἰς τὴν Κοιτικὴν λαογραφίαν ἐπὶ Βενετοκρατίας*, *Ἑπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας ἱερητικῶν Σπουδῶν*, III (1940), 25; Polites, *Σύμμεκτα*, III, 325-26; Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, pp. 97-98; Anrich (ed.), *Hagios Nikolaos*, II, 249.
31. *Palladii Vita Chrysostomi*, p. 110.
32. Rudolf Shoell and G. Kroll (eds.), *Iustiniani Novellae* (Berlin, 1928), III, 269-70.
33. D. Butler, "Copiate," *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, I, 459; cf. Rush, *Antiquity*, pp. 111-112. No doubt, the increase of Christians following the Peace of Constantine had much to do, as Rush points out, with the need for such a class to see that the dead received proper care and burial (*Ibid.*, p. 112). See also Epiphanius, "De Fide," *Ancoratus und Panarion*

- Haeresiarum*, 3 vols. Ed. by Karl Holl (Leipzig, 1915-1933), III, 522.
34. Hesiod *Works and Days* 116. See Spyridakes, *Ἡθικά*, 103.
 35. Chrysostom, "In Paralyticum demissum per tectum," PG, LI, 62. Cf. Epiphanius, *De Fide*, III, 522; Chrysostom, "Homilia LXVII in Genesim," PG, LIV, 577. See Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, pp. 123-124. Other terms used less extensively by the Byzantines for the same purpose included *θάνα* (death) and *ἐξοδος* (exit). From the moment of death, among other terms we find the deceased referred to as *μακαρίτης* (blessed) and the corpse as the *λείψανον* (relic or remains).
 36. Denys Gorce (ed.), *Vie de Sainte Melanie* (Paris, 1962) p. 266.
 37. Chrysostom, "In Job," PG, LVI, 567. Cf. Chrysostom, "Ad Stragiriam ascetam," PG, XLVII, 456; Chrysostom, "Ad populum Antiochenum," PG, XLIX, 212. See Loukatos, *Ἐνδοξασμοί*, 46-47; Spyridakes, *Ἡθικά* 104.
 38. *Ibid.*, 104.
 39. Eusebios, «Εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ Μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου Βασιλέως», in *Eusebius Werke*, 7 vols. Ed. by Ivar A. Heikel (Leipzig, 1902) (Part of *Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*), I, 144-145. John of Damascus, "S. Artemii Passio," PG, XCVI, 1269. Zosimos, *Historiae*, CSHB p. 246; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 74.
 40. John of Damascus, "S. Artemii Passio," PG, XCVI, 1269. A body thus preserved was regarded as not yet ready for permanent burial and was called *νέκδουμ* by the Byzantines, from the Latin expression *necdum homo mandatum cadaver*. See Charles De Fresne Ducange (ed.), *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis*, 2 vols. (Lyons, 1688), I, 990.
 41. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 145; Socrates, "Historia Ecclesiastica," PG, LXVII, 180; John of Damascus, *S. Artemii Passio*, 1269.
 42. *Ibid.* Cf. Vitzentzos Kornaros, *Ἡρώδοτος*. Ed. by Stephanos Xanthoudides (Athens, 1968), pp. 349-50, where the same custom is mentioned by a Cretan poet of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. The atmosphere of the times following the fall of Constantinople (1453) is reflected, as to earlier times, in this bleak picture of soldiers garbed in black while lifting their dead emperor.
 43. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 145. Cf. Socrates, PG, LXVII, 180; Ludwig Dindorf (ed.), *Paschalion Chronicon*, CSHB, I, 533. Zosimos, *Historiae*, p. 172. *Ibid.*, p. 246; cf. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, I, 74.
 44. Theophilos, Ioannou (ed.), *Μνημεῖα Ἀγιολογικὰ (Βενετία, 1884)*, p. 224. Gregory of Nyssa, "Oratio Funebris in Flacillam Imperatricem," ed. by Andreas Spira in *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, 9 vols. Ed. by Werner Jaeger (Leiden, 1952-1967), IX, 481-482.
 45. George Pachymeres, *Paleologus*, I, 124-126.
 46. Spyridakes, *Ἡθικά*, 106; Polites, *Σύμμελτα*, II, 273 n. 4.
 47. Homer *Iliad* 18.343-50, cf. 8.425; Homer *Odyssey* 24.83; Euripides *The Phoenician Maidens* 1667. For further discussion, see Voulodemos, *Δοκίμιον* II, 364-365. See also Edwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Beliefs in Immortality Among the Greeks*. Trans. from the 8th German

ed. by W. B. Hillis (New York, 1925), p. 17. On the washing of the corpse with mixtures of honey, milk and oil by Homeric and other Greeks as libations to the gods, see Rush, *Antiquity*, pp. 115-116. Rush's opinion is challenged by G. E. Mylonas in "Homeric and Mycenaean Burial Customs," *American Journal of Archaeology*, LII (1948), 58, who suggests that use of such items for washing the body looked more toward protection against decomposition than to offering of gifts of food to the gods. In any case, the Byzantines did not make use of such mixtures.

48. Lucian, *On Funerals*, 11.
49. George Thilo and Hermann Hagen (eds.), *Servii Grammatici qui ferunter in Vergilli carmina commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1887-1923), II, 41. See also Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.218-219.
50. *Antiquity*, pp. 114-115.
51. See *ibid.*, p. 114; Shinedling, *Burial Customs*, II, 597, 598; Alfred P. Bender, "Beliefs, Rites and Customs connected with Death, Burial and Mourning as illustrated in the Bible and Later Jewish Literature," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* O.S., VII (1895), 259; Zlotnick, "Mourning," pp. 31, 98 n. 3; Kallinikos, *Ἐθνομίαις* 201-02; Jacobus Goar (ed.), *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum* (Venice, 1730), pp. 438, 451.
52. Symeon of Thessalonike, "De Ordine Sepulture," *PG*, CLV, 676.
53. Gregory Nazianzenos, "Oratio XL in Sanctum Baptisma," *PG*, XXXVI, 372-73.
54. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita SS. Inde et Domnae," *PG*, CXVI, 1080.
55. Homer *Iliad* 18.343-50.
56. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (ed.), *Varia Graeca Sacra* (St. Petersburg, 1909), p. 52.
57. "Acta S. Febroniae," *AS*, XXVII, 28; Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita S. Marciani Presbyteri," *PG*, CXIV, 453; Chrysostom, "In Job," *PG*, LVI, 567; Gregory Nazianzenos, "Oratio XL in Sanctum Baptisma," *PG*, XXXVI, 373; Theodoros Prodromos, *Στίχοι*, p. 384; Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita SS. Inde et Domnae," *PG*, CXVI, 1080; Leontios of Neapolis, "Vita S. Symeonis Sali Confessore," *AS*, XXVIII, 150; Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita S. Marciani Presbyteri," *PG*, CXIV, 449.
58. See above, nn. 32 and 33. An exception, it would seem, is the case of the washing of the body of the emperor John II Komnenos (d. 1143). Theodoros Prodromos, the monastic Byzantine philosopher, on two occasions depicts the widowed empress Irene lamenting the fact that she personally (one is led to believe) bathed the corpse: "Who prepared the wretched bath for you?"; "and dead (alas! must I say it?), who has bathed you?" Considering, however, the understandable desire of Prodromos to magnify the mournful atmosphere in this poetic tribute to the widowed empress, whom he admired so greatly, it is doubtful that he would have been overly concerned with the accuracy of such details. See Theodoros Prodromos, *Στίχοι*, pp. 383, 384.
59. Ch. Lecrivain, "Fusus (Grece)," II, 1371 and Fig. 3334; Voulodemos, *Ἀποτάφισις*, pp. 364-65; Mau, *Bestattung*, III, 334; Blumner, *Romischen*, p. 484.
60. Shinedling, *Burial Customs*, 597 Pl., 598.

61. For a discussion of such notions, see Spyridakes, "Εθιμα", 108-10
62. Lucas of Cryptoferri, "Vita et conversation S Bartholomaei iunioris Cryptoferriensis," PG, CXXXVII, 496. As seen in the words of Symeon of Thessalonike (above, n 52), by the 15th century the corpse of a cleric or a layman was washed only partially. This might well be an indication of the decline of the attitude which saw the corpse as being demonically contaminated. For, as Spyridakes suggests, such a decline would seem natural as the society became more civilized and knowledgeable. See his "Εθιμα", 108
63. Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμὸς, IV, 154. See also Kallinikos, Φρονιές 201-02, H. Delehaye (ed.), *Les Legendes grecques des saints militaires* (Paris, 1909), p. 146
64. Homer *Odyssey* 24.44, 71. See Kallinikos, Φρονιές 201-02. There is no doubt that the Jews, like other ancient peoples, used wine as an agent for cleaning bones of the dead before they were placed in a sheet and/or ossuary. See Zlotnick, *Mourning*, p. 161 n. 9. The subject of Jewish ossuaries has been treated in depth recently by Eric M. Meyers, *Jewish Ossuaries: Reburial and Rebirth* (Biblica et Orientalia, No. 24 (Rome, 1971)). See also Saul Lieberman, "Some Aspects of After Life in Early Rabbinic Literature" in *Harry J. Wolfson Jubilee Volume*, 3 vols (Jerusalem, 1965), I, 509 n. 20
65. See Rush, *Antiquity*, pp. 117-123 for a detailed account of this practice among ancient cultures and early Christians, of which those at Alexandria also resorted, though not on a wide scale, to the Egyptian custom of embalming. Rush concedes that anointing with myrrh among the Alexandrian Christians, as with those elsewhere, was the more usual practice.
66. See *ibid.*, p. 121, Matthew 26:12, John 19:40
67. Lucian, *On Funerals* 11.
68. Clement of Alexandria *Paedagogus* 2.7, 8, "Acta SS. Manuel, Sabel, Ismael," AS, XXIV, 237, "Translationes S. Euphemiae," AS, XLV, 276, "Acta S. Febroniae," AS, XXVII, 28.
69. Pseudo-Athanasios, "Vita S. Syncleticae," PG, XXVIII, 1556.
70. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio funebris in Meletium Episcopum*, *Opera*, IX, 448.
71. Chrysostom, "Homilia LXXXV in Joannem," PG, LIX, 464. See Rush, *Antiquity*, pp. 123-124.
72. John of Damascus, "S. Artemii Passio," PG, XCVI, 1316.
73. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita SS. Eugenii et Mariae," PG, CXV, 353. Marinos (Maria) had been accused of defiling a young girl in the neighborhood of the monastery, and accepted the unfounded charges rather than reveal that he (she) was a woman.
74. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Martyrium S. Charitinae," PG, CXV, 1005. Cf. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Martyrium S. Vari," PG, CXV, 1152.
75. "Acta graeca SS. Davidis, Symeonis et Georgii, Mitylenae in insula Lesbos," AB, XVIII (1899), 259, H. Delehaye (ed.), "Saint Théodote de Nicée," AB, LV (1937), 219, Albert Vogt (ed.), "Vie de S. Luc le Stylite," AB, XXVIII (1909), 55, cf. 52.

76. Theodore Mommsen and Paul Krueger (eds.), *Iustiniani Digesta* (Berlin, 1928), I, 189.
77. Rhalles, G. A. and M. Potles (eds.), *Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν ἱκανόνων*, 6 vols. (Athens, 1852-1859), IV, 467 The custom of anointing the dead with Chrism, which certainly appears to be a remnant of the early Christian practice of waiting until death was imminent before being baptized, was not limited to be sure to the Alexandrian Church. For example, Chrysostom in his "De Patientia," PG, LX, 725, an Antiochean who some eight hundred years earlier became bishop of Constantinople, says the following: "We pour on myrrh and oil and chrism of baptism, believing it to accompany them as a travel allowance."
78. Loukatos, *Ἐνδείξις*, 49.
79. Homer *Iliad* 18.352-353; 24.588; *Odyssey* 2.96-102; 19.142; 24.132; Euripides *Alcestis* 158-161. See Lécrivain, "Funus (Grece)," 1367-1368; Mau, "Bestattung," 332. Martial *Epigrammata* 9.57.8; Juvenal *Saturae* 3. 171-172. See Mau, "Bestattung," 348; Blümner, *Römischen*, p. 484; Shinedling, "Burial Customs," 598; Zlotnick, "Mourning," pp. 76, 82.
80. Rush, *Antiquity*, pp. 128-133.
81. *Ibid.* See also Shinedling, *Burial Customs*, 595 Pl., 598. The fact that Jesus, following the Jewish tradition, was wrapped in such a linen (Matt. 27:59-60) doubtless influenced the Byzantine and other Christians to follow the same practice.
82. Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, pp. 280, 468. This term was derived from the name Lazarus (John 11:43-44), who had been buried in linen (see Koukoules, *Ἑνδείξις*, IV, 156).
83. Emmanuel Georgillas, "Τὸ Θανατικὸν τῆς Ρόδου," *Medieval Greek Texts*. Ed. by Wilhelm Wagner (London, 1870), p. 189; Franz X. Drexl (ed.), *Ahmad Ibn Sirin: Achmetis Oneirocriticon* (Leipzig, 1925), p. 115. The word *σάβανον* (from the Latin *sabanum* according to Ducange, *Glossarium Graecitatis*, II, 1313) seems to have received a rather different meaning in the late Byzantine era than that which it carried in the earlier centuries. At least as late as the tenth century, *σάβανον* meant the sheet which covered the already linen-swaddled corpse. A testimony to this meaning is a tenth-century account of a grave-robbery, told by Nicephoros the Constantinopolitan presbyter in the life of St. Andrew Salos: "He (i.e. the robber) lifted off the *σάβανον* . . . and the misanthropic devil compelled him to remove the linen as well, leaving the body naked." Nikephoros of Constantinople, "Vita S. Andreae Sali," PG, CXI, 745. It was only in the final centuries of the Byzantine Empire that the term *σάβανον* began to be used for referring to the under-linen which shrouded the body, and the late literary sources attest this usage. Modern Greeks continue to use the term with this latter meaning. See Polites, *Σύμβολα*, III, 326; Spyridakes, *Ἑθνομ.*, 111.
84. Chrysostom, "In Joannem Homilia LXXXV," PG, LIX, 467-468.
85. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 402, 403; D. Gorce (ed.), *Vie de Sainte Mélanie*, 268-270; Basil the Great, "Sermo XII, De Animi Dejectione," PG, XXXII, 1284; Cosmas of Jerusalem, "Commentarii in S. Gregorii Nazianseni Carmina," PG, XXXVIII, 361;

- Chrysostom, "In Matthaëum Homilia XXVII," PG, LVII, 348, Chrysostom, "De Jejuno," PG, LX, 715. See Loukatos, *Ἐνδεδίξας*, pp. 47-48 for a discussion of these terms.
86. See "In Matthaëum Homilia XXVII," PG, LVII, 348-350.
 87. *Ibid.*, 348, 349, Chrysostom, "In Joannem Homilia LXIII," PG, LIX, 351, Basil the Great, "Sermo XII, De Animi Dejectione," PG, XXXII, 1284, Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 399. Mavrogordatos, *Digenes Akrites*, p. 224, Eduard Kurtz and Francis Drexel (eds.), *Michaelis Pselli Scripta Minora* (Milan, 1936), p. 152.
 88. See Polites, *Σύμμετρον*, III, 327 n. 2, Spyridakes, *Ἐθιμα*, 111.
 89. Eduard Kurtz (ed.), "Des klerikers Gregorios Bericht über Leben, Wunderthaten und Translation der Hl. Theodora von Thessalonich nebst der metaphrase des Joannes Stavrakios," *Memoirs de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg, classe Historico-Philologique*, 8th Ser., VI, 1 (1902), 41.
 90. Loukatos, *Ἐνδεδίξας*, 49 and n. 7. Loukatos goes on to suggest that the Byzantines knew the methods of embalming known to ancient peoples, and that they made use of them for transferring the body of an emperor back to the capital (*ibid.*, 49-50). Also, his opinion that the Christians of Alexandria used Egyptian methods of embalming on a limited basis is shared by Rush, *Antiquity*, p. 119. See also Athanasios, "Vita S. Antonii," PG, XXVI, 968-969.
 91. D. Gorce (ed.), *Vie de Sainte Mélanie*, p. 270. See also John Moschos, "Pratum Spirituale," PG, LXXXVII, 2932-2933, "Vita S. Marthae Martis S. Symeonis Junioris Stylitae," AS, XVIII, 407, Kurtz (ed.), "Theodora," 41, Delehaye, *Saints Militaires*, p. 146.
 92. Epiphanius, "De Fide," *Ancoratus und Panarion*, III, 522. Cf. Chrysostom, "De S. Droside Martyre," PG, L, 691 and Symeon Metaphrastes, "Martyrium S. Severiani," PG, CXV, 652. For the origins of this class, see above, pp. 5-6.
 93. Koukoules, *Ἐθιμα*, IV, 157.
 94. Lucian *On Funerals* 11, Aelian *Various Histories* 1.16. See also Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 27, *Solon* 21. The custom of dressing the dead with rich clothes dates back among the Greeks to the fifth century B.C. as indicated in the Kean laws. See Wilhelm Dittenberger (ed.), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1898-1901), II, 725-726. For a discussion of this practice in modern Greece, see Loukatos, *Ἐνδεδίξας*, 51-52.
 95. See above, p. 7 and n. 37. "In Job," PG, LVI, 567.
 96. "De Patientia," PG, LX, 725. On the use of new, white clothing, see Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 406, Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita SS. Inde et Domnae," PG, CXVI, 1080, Kallinikos, *Ἐθιμα*, pp. 202-03, and Koukoules, *Ἐθιμα*, IV, 160 n. 8.
 97. Chrysostom, "In Epistolam ad Hebraeos Homilia XI," PG, LXIII, 94. See also Chrysostom, "In Joannem Homilia LXXXV," PG, LIX, 466-468.
 98. Basil the Great, "Homilia in Divites," PG, XXXI, 304.
 99. "De S. Droside Martyre," PG, L, 692. See Chrysostom, "In Epistolam ad

- Hebraeos Homilia XI," PG, LXIII, 94; Chrysostom, "Ecloga de morte, Homilia XXXI," PG, LXIII, 811; Chrysostom, "De S. Pelagia Homilia I," PG, L, 582; Chrysostom, "De Anna Sermo V," PG, LIV, 675. See also Demetrios Balanos, «Η πολιτεία κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας», *Νέα Σιὼν*, XVII (1922), 427-28; Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, pp. 98-99.
100. John Moschos, "Pratum Spirituale, Caput LXXVIII," PG, 2932.
 101. Chrysostom, "Homilia LXVI in Genesim," PG, LIV, 566; Chrysostom, "De Anna Sermo V," PG, LIV, 675.
 102. Gregory of Nyssa, "De vita S. Patris Ephraem Syri," PG, XLVI, 845. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, "In Meletium Episcopum," *Opera*, IX, 448. See Loukatos, *Ἐνδεξις*, 51-52.
 103. Symeon of Thessalonica, "De Ordine Sepulture," PG, CLV, 676; "Vita S. Eliae Spelaote," AS, XLIII, 862; D. Gorce (ed.), *Vie de Sainte Melanie*, pp. 268-270; Gregory of Nyssa, "De vita S. Patris Ephraem Syri," PG, XLVI, 845. See also Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν*, IV, 160; Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, p. 98; Spyridakes, *Ἐθιμα*, 112 n. 7.
 104. See Loukatos, *Ἐνδεξις*, 51.
 105. For the dressing of the dead among these classes, see Roger A. Pack (ed.), *Artemidori Daldiani Oniroticon Libri V* (Leipzig, 1963), p. 102.
 106. See Blümner, *Römischen*, p. 484; Voulodemos, *Δοξίμικον*, p. 366; Shinedling, *Burial Customs*, 596, 598. The earliest Jewish custom was to bury the deceased in one of his simple, daily garments. During the late Talmudic period extreme lavishness and costliness became popular, and not until the end of the first Christian century did an element of moderation return. During the Tannaitic period the color of the burial tunic was white; however, in the middle ages colors were introduced, especially red.
 107. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita SS. Inde et Domnae," PG, CXVI, 1080. See also Pack (ed.), *Artemidori Oniroticon*, p. 102. Cf. Lucian, *The Love of Lies* 32.
 108. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν*, IV, 160.
 109. Clugnet (ed.), *Daniel de Scétiote*, p. 67.
 110. D. Gorce (ed.) *Vie de Sainte Mélanie*, p. 268. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 403.
 111. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 406. See also Friedrich Drexl (ed.), "Das anonyme Traumbuch des Cod. Paris gr. 2511," *Διογرافία*, VIII (1925), 364.
 112. Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *De Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, CSHB, 407, 422.
 113. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν*, IV, 230-231.
 114. Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, pp. 466-467; Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Consolatoria in Pulcheriam*, IX, 468-70.
 115. Sebastian C. Estopañan (ed.), *Skyllitzes Matritensis* (Barcelona, 1965), pp. 318 Pl. 283, 345 Pls. 362 and 364.
 116. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 146. Socrates, "Historia Ecclesia," PG, LVII, 179.
 117. *Ibid.*

118. The emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos (913-959) mentions that the plain surplice was worn by the emperor at the liturgical observance of Holy Saturday. See Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *Le Livre des Cérémonies*, 2 vols. Ed. by Albert Vogt (Paris, 1935-1940), I, Pt. I, 169. The ornate surplice, however, was worn at the coronation of the emperor. See Leo Grammaticos, *Chronographia*, CSHB, p. 246.
119. Pachymeres, *Paleologus*, I, 125.
120. Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *Le Livre des Cérémonies*, II, Pt. I, 84. See also Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *De Cerimoniis*, p. 423, where a description is given of the dressing of the corpse of the emperor Zeno (474-491).
121. Wilhelm Wagner (ed.), *Carmina Graeci Medii Aevi* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 261.
122. Kornaros, *Ἡρώτοκριτος*, p. 349.
123. Homer *Iliad* 18.29-30, 23.134. See Clement of Alexandria *Paedagogus* 3.11.63. See also Ernst Samter, *Hochzeit und Tod. Beiträge zur vergleichenden Volkskunde* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 180-182. Cf. Shinedling, "Burial Customs," 598, and Epiphanius, "De Fide," *Ancoratus und Panarion*, III, 524.
124. N. Sathas (ed.), *Μεγαλὴ Ἑλλανοῦ ἱστορικὴ λόγος, ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ ἄλλα ἀνέκδοτα*. Μεσσαωνικῇ Βιβλιοθήκῃ, No. 5 (Paris, 1876), p. 32.
125. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Martyrium S. Severiani," *PG*, CXV, 652; Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," *Opera*, VIII, Pt. I, 406.
126. Drexl (ed.), *Achmetis Oneirocriticon*, p. 211; Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν*, IV, 160; Polites, *Σύμμεκτα*, III, 327-28.
127. Rohde, *Psyche*, pp. 164, 189 n. 40; Voulodemos, *Δοξίμειον*, pp. 367, 369; Blümner, *Römischen*, p. 485; Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, p. 15 and n. 10. For a discussion of the essential continuity of this custom in ancient, Byzantine and modern Greek times, see Spyridakes, *Ἡθολογία*, pp. 114-15.
128. Blümner, *Römischen*, p. 245.
129. See Petrakakos, *Die Toten*, p. 98. See also Lucian *On Funerals* 11.
130. Euripides *Alcestis* 664, *Suppliants* 53; Herodotus *Histories* 5.8; Demosthenes *Against Marcartatus* 62; Lysias *Against Eratosthenes* 18; Homer *Iliad* 19.212; Dio Cassius *Roman History* 44.35.4, 58.2.1, 59.3.7; Persius *Saturae* 3.104; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 9.504; Suetonius *Octavius* 100. See Polites, *Σύμμεκτα*, III, 328; Loukatos, *Ἡθολογία*, 53; Joachim Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer* (Vol. VII, J. Marquardt and T. Mommsen, eds., *Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer*) (Leipzig, 1886), p. 347 and n. 9.
131. Chrysostom, "Ad populum Antiochenum," *PG*, XLIX, 155; Loukatos, *Ἡθολογία*, 52. In modern Greece the practice is to use the room closest to the door or the largest room in the house.
132. "Vita S. Basilii Junioris," *AS*, IX, *31; "Acta S. Febroniae," *AS*, XXVII, 27; Herman Userner (ed.), *Der heilige Tychon* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 138.
133. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita S. Theodora Alexandrinae," *PG*, CXV, 689. See Spyridakes, *Ἡθολογία*, 118. The corpse of a priest or bishop in modern Orthodox practice is likewise laid out in the church.
134. Spyridakes, *Ἡθολογία*, 116-18.

135. Genesis 2:8. See Basil the Great, "Liber de Spiritu Sancto," PG, XXXII, 189-192; Gregory of Nyssa, "De Oratione Dominica," PG, XLIV, 1184.
136. Loukatos, Ἰουδαϊσμοί, 53.
137. Chrysostom, "De Patientia," PG, LX, 725. See Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," Opera, VIII, Pt. I, 396.
138. Spyridakes, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, 116; B. Schmidt, "Totengebräuche und Gräberkultus im heutigen Griechenland," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, XXIV (1926), 285. An apparently modern innovation is the practice sometimes found in the Orthodox world of turning the corpse of a cleric toward his congregation (i.e. the West).
139. D. Gorce (ed.), Vie de Sainte Mélanie, 268-270; Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," Opera, VIII, Pt. I, 399. See Koukoules, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, IV, 157. In ancient Greece, a Delphic law prescribed that a pillow was to be placed under the deceased's head, and his face was to be covered. See Hans von Prott and Ludovic Ziehen (eds.), Leges Graecorum sacrae e titulis collectae, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1896-1906), II, 217, 219. See also Polites, Σύμμετακτα, III, 329 nn. 1, 4; but, cf. Charles Picard, La vie privée dans la Grèce classique (Paris, 1930), p. 42. On the matter of leaving the face uncovered in Christian and Byzantine practice, see Kallinikos, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, 244-45 and Spyridakes, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, 116.
140. Athanasios, "Vita S. Antonii," PG, XXVI, 969. See Koukoules, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, IV, 157-158.
141. Chrysostom, "In Psalmum XLVIII," PG, LV, 512; Userner (ed.), Tychon, p. 138; Sathas (ed.), Ἱεροεὐχὰς, p. 80.
142. Lucian On Funerals 12. See Loukatos, Ἰουδαϊσμοί, 53-54, who mentions that in some parts of modern Greece the casket is set on the floor so as to be on a level with the dirge-singers, who squat or kneel.
143. Gregory of Nyssa, "Vita S. Macrinae," Opera, VIII, Pt. I, 399; D. Gorce (ed.), Vie de Sainte Mélanie, 268; Kurtz (ed.), "Theodora," 41; Anonymous, "Vita S. Nicolai Studitae," PG, CV, 921. See also Eduard Kurtz (ed.), "Zwei Griechische Text über die Heilige Theophano, die Gemahlin Kaisers Leo VI," Memoirs de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg, classe Historico-Philologique, 8th Ser., III, 2 (1898), 16; Mavrogordatos (ed.), Digenes Akrites, p. 225; Polites, Σύμμετακτα, III, 329; Kallinikos, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, 200-01.
144. Symeon of Thessalonike, "De Ordine Sepulture," PG, CLV, 676.
145. Ibid.
146. Ibid. See also Petrakakos, Die Toten, pp. 98. 106.
147. Rhallès, Σύναγμα, II, 496; but, cf. canon 83 of the Trullan Synod (691) in The Seven Ecumenical Councils, ed. by Henry R. Percival (Vol. XIV, Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2d Ser.) (New York, 1900), p. 401. See Petrakakos, Die Toten, p. 106; Schmidt, "Totengebräuche," 288.
148. Theodore Studites, "Vita," PG, XCIX, 325. See Koukoules, Ἱεροεὐχὰς, IV, 161. For the Roman practice, see Ernst Samter, "Antike und Moderne Totengebräuche," Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum Geschichte

- und *Deutsch Literatur*, XV (1905), 34-36, Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 44. For the modern Greek practice, see Polites, *Σύμμεττα*, III, 329-330 and n. 1.
149. Symeon Metaphrastes, "Vita S. Cornelii Centurionis," *PG*, CXIV, 1308.
150. Spyridon Sygkollites, «'Ο νεκρὸς στήν 'Ανασελίτσα,» *Λαογραφία*, XI (1937), 391.
151. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινὸν*, IV, 158.
152. Anrich (ed.), *Hagios Nikolaos*, I, 54, Kallinikos, *Προντζ*, 200-01.
153. Lucian *On Funerals* 10. See Polites, *Σύμμεττα*, III, 331 nn. 4, 5 for references to the custom in antiquity.
154. Voulodemos, *Δοξίμουν*, II, 373, Lucian *On Funerals* 10, Polites, *Σύμμεττα* III, 331. See Hugo Blümner, *The Home Life of the Ancient Greeks*. Trans. from the German by Alice Zimmern (New York, n.d.), 245, who forwards the opinion that the coin was placed in the deceased's mouth (as opposed to the hand) by the ancient Greeks because they habitually carried a coin in their mouths during life as a matter of convenience, for their garments had no pockets.
155. See Koukoules, *Βυζαντινὸν*, IV, 158.
156. Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, 467, Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *Le Livre des Cérémonies*, II, Pt. I, 84.
157. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 145, Socrates, "Historia Ecclesia," *PG*, LXVII, 180, Gregory of Nyssa, "In Pulcheriam," *Opera*, IX, 463, Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *Le Livre des Cérémonies*, II, Pt. I, 84. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, "In Flacillam," *Opera*, IX, 481.
158. Theophanes Continuatus, *Chronographia*, 468.
159. Gregory of Nyssa, "In Pulcheriam," *Opera*, IX, 463-464.
160. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 147, Socrates, "Historia Ecclesia," *PG*, LXVII, 180.
161. Eusebios, *Βίον Κωνσταντίνου*, I, 145, Kurtz (ed.), "Theophano," 16. The candles held by clergy and attendants during an all-night vigil at the πρόθεσις (an example of which is seen in a plate of the πρόθεσις of Michael II, 820-829) supplemented those which stood on pedestals. See Koukoules, *Βυζαντινὸν*, IV, 233 and Fig. See also Theophylactos of Simocatta, *Historia*. Ed. by Carl de Boor (Leipzig, 1887), p. 43.
162. The Chalke was a brass-roofed vestibule near the Augustaeum and Imperial Palace, and was reserved for important ceremonies.
163. Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *Le Livre des Cérémonies*, II, Pt. I, 84. See Tamara Talbot Rice, *Everyday Life in Byzantium* (New York, 1967), pp. 55-56.
164. See Koukoules, *Βυζαντινὸν*, IV, 233 and n. 5.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

**THE ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS LIBRARY
OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES**

NO. 3

N. M. Vaporis, General Editor

**CODEX (B') BETA
OF THE
ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE:**

**ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY OF THE
CHURCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE**

by

Nomikos Michael Vaporis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Bibliographical Abbreviations	11
Glossary of Terms	17
Table of the Regesta	19
The Regesta	22

INTRODUCTION

Codex Beta is the second of the codices from the archives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, dated from the fall of the City to the Ottoman Turks, that I have the pleasure of presenting. **Codex Beta** is also the second oldest of the codices, containing documents written from 1616-1646. It consists of one hundred and eight pages of which twenty-nine are blank. The remaining seventy-nine pages contain sixty-eight documents, really sixty-six, since the texts in No. 2 (p. 105) and No. 3 (p. 105) are identical except for the signatures, as are Nos. 47 (p. 82) and 48 (pp. 99-100), except that No. 48 has a more complete text.

The sixty-six documents were issued during the tenures of Patriarchs Timotheos II (Nos. 1-20), Kyrillos I (Nos. 21-49), Kyrillos II (Nos. 50-57), Parthenios I (Nos. 60-67), and Ioannikios II (No. 68).

The sixty-six documents of the Codex can be grouped as follows: twenty-nine are elections (Nos. 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 53, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66), eight are depositions (Nos. 2-3, 37, 41, 52, 58, 63, 64, 67), seven are resignations (Nos. 13, 15, 17, 19, 25, 28, 62), six are hierarchical confessions of faith (Nos. 4, 23, 30, 38, 45, 54), five deal with financial matters (Nos. 24, 36, 50, 51, 56), two are excommunications (Nos. 47-48, 49), two are exonerationes (Nos. 6, 34), two deal with ecclesiastical boundaries (Nos. 1, 7), one with heresy (No. 57), and the remaining four are respectively, a tax exemption (No. 68), a confirmation of the rights of a monastery (No. 55), a petition (No. 32), and an invalidation of an election (No. 8).

According to a note by Archimandrites Ioakeim Phoropoulos, who served as Chief Archivist of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (see my **Codex Gamma**, p. 5), on the "title page" of the MS, **Codex Beta** was "found at the Phanar on 7 October 1909." On the last page, added during the binding, he noted that the Codex was "collected" by him on July 1895.

The MS is paper, folio (39 x 26.5 cm.) and was bound in 1895. The MS is generally in fair condition: the first sheet was torn in

half lengthwise, while twenty-four pages are marred with doodling and other irrelevant drawing of sorts, often over the text. One gets the strong impression that scribes, probably deacons, anticipating their future promotion, used many pages of the MS, even where there is a text, to practice writing intricate episcopal signatures and patriarchal menologemata. The remainder of the MS is in rather good condition and clearly written except of course for the names of the signatories. On the spine of the cover of the MS the following can be read: **Kodix Hypomnematon | kai Sigillion 1616-1641 | B' ! 2 | A/2 | Kodix | Hypomnematon kai Sigillion | 1616-1641.**

The MS is not unknown; it has been used by a number of researchers in the past, especially by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (see his *Hierosolymetike Vivliotheke*, IV, 7). He described the MS as follows: "A synodical codex of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, of which only fifty-four leaves are extant, containing the original of various synodical and patriarchal letters and acts. It [measures] .39 by 26.5 cm."

Papadopoulos-Kerameus reviewed the MS when it was part of the Library of the Metochion of the Holy Sepulcher, housed on the island of Halke. He treats the documents in the order in which they appear in the MS (*ibid.*, pp. 7-21). He cites sixty-two of the documents, gives resumes of others, and the text of six (Nos. 34, 47, 48, 50, 51, 62) in his *Vivliotheke* and of seven others in his *Analekta* (Nos. 7, 8, 23, 24, 36, 58, 59). But he does not always record all the signatories nor all of the names and details in the texts. On rare occasions there are misreadings of the signatories. Moreover, this indefatigable scholar of the history of the Orthodox Patriarchates omitted four documents (Nos. 26, 32, 60, and 61). I suspect that some of the pages of the MS were missing at the time Papadopoulos-Kerameus examined it and were added later when it was bound.

In the presentation of the documents, I have, as in *Codex Gamma*, included all the personal and place names that appear, offices, monasteries, sees, etc., as well as a concise but full summary of the document. Whenever possible I have noted who has published it and who has cited it.

Over all, the MS makes a considerable contribution to the prosopography (primarily hierarchs) of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. These contributions are pointed out in the notes that follow the documents and in Appendix A at the end of the study.

Initially, I have checked the chronology and the lists of hierarchs with those that appear in the twelve volume *Threskeutike kai Ethike Egkyklopaideia* (Athens: 1962-1968), in the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de ecclesiastiques* (Paris: 1912—), and the latest lists by Vasileios Ateses, former Metropolitan of Lemnos, appearing in *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* (Alexandria: 1974—). Beyond this, I have used the bibliography noted in the study with no attempt to give full bibliographical references. Unfortunately, some bibliography still remains inaccessible to me. I leave it to those to whom it is accessible to correct any errors that appear in the study and to add information where I have been forced to remain silent.

The first number that appears at the head of each document is my own based on the chronology of the document; the second is that of the MS. (*Codex Beta* was numbered twice; once by sheets (Nos. 1-54) and once by pages (Nos. 1-108). Wherever the letter *b* accompanies a number of the MS, this means that the document begins on the second half of that page.

Unless accompanied by the election date and the date of death, deposition, expulsion, or resignation, the phrase in the notes "inclusive dates" indicates the earliest and latest dates known to me.

A final note on the Index. In the case of the hierarchs, I have listed all the documents in which they appear or are referred to in the notes of the documents which cite them for the first time. I have not repeated this in the Index. There only the first number appears. In the case of the sees, I have listed all the documents whenever the hierarch has changed.

The following signs have been employed in the study:

. . . = illegible signatures that I have been unable to decipher.

[] = material not found in the MS.

& = used when a see has a double name.

* = indicates a contribution to the chronology of the hierarch. Used in Appendix A.

** = indicates hierarch previously unknown. Used in Appendix A.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Alexoudes, Leukoma.

Anthimos Alexoudes, "Χρονολογικοί κατάλογοι τῶν ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπων κατ' ἐπαρχίας, Πανελλήνιον Λεύκωμα Ἑθνικῆς Ἑκατονταετηρίδος, Vol. VI. Ἐκκλησιακλῆρος. Athens, 1922.

Arampatzoglou, Orthodoxia.

Gennadios Arampatzoglou, "Σκιαγραφία τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς Μητροπόλεως Χαλκηδόνος καὶ ὁ ἐπισκοπικὸς αὐτῆς κατάλογος," Ὁρθοδοξία, XIX (1944), 17-20, 38-41, 70-75, 120-24, 143-45.

Arampatzoglous, Photieios.

Gennadios Arampatzoglou, Φωτίειος Βιβλιοθήκη. 2 vols. Constantinople, 1933-1935.

AEKD. Ἀρχεῖον Ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ καὶ Κανονικοῦ Δικαίου.

Archeion. Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ Θρακικοῦ Λαογραφικοῦ καὶ Γλωσσικοῦ Θεσαυροῦ.

Ateses, I.

Vasileios Ateses, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον," EPH, LVI (1974), pp. 105-80, 417-96.

Ateses, II.

Vasileios Ateses, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι σήμερον," EPH, LVII (1975), pp. 111-73.

Ateses, Lemnos.

Vasileios Ateses, Ἡ Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Λήμνου διὰ μέσου τῶν αἰώνων. Athens, 1957.

Athenagoras,

Metropolitan Athenagoras, "Ὁ θεσμὸς τῶν συγκέλλων ἐν τῷ Οἰκουμενικῷ Πατριαρχείῳ," EEBS, IV (1927), 3-38; V (1928), 169-92; VI (1929), 103-42.

Chamoudopoulos, EA.

Menas Chamoudopoulos, Ἀρχιερατικά ἐναλλαγαί, Ἑκκλησιαστική Ἀλήθεια, II (1882), 668-70, 695-97.

Chrysanthos, Trapezous.

Chrysanthos, Metropolitan of Trapezous. Ἡ Ἑκκλησία Τραπεζοῦντος. Athens, 1933.

Codex Alpha.

Κώδιξ Ὑπομνημάτων καὶ Σιγιλλίων 1539-1684. Α' παλαιὸς ἀριθμὸς 333. Patriarchal Archives. Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Delikanes, II.

Kallinikos Delikanes, Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Ἀρχιεποφυλακίου σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικά ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας, Ἀντιοχείας, Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Κύπρου 1574-1863 περισυλλεγένη καὶ συναρμολογηθέντα κελεύσει τῆς Α.Θ. Παναγιότητος τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἰωακείμ τοῦ Γ' Constantinople, 1904.

Delikanes, III.

Kallinikos Delikanes. Πατριαρχικῶν Ἐγγράφων Τόμος Τρίτος ἥτοι Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ ἀρχιεποφυλακίου σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικά ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς Ἑκκλησίας Ρωσσίας, Βλαχίας καὶ Μολδαβίας, Σερβίας Ἀχριδῶν καὶ Πεκίου 1564-1863 οἷς προστίθεται ἱστορικὴ μελέτη περὶ τῆς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Ἀχριδῶν. Constantinople, 1905.

DIEE Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας Ἑλλάδος.

Demetrakopoulos, Posthe kai

Andronikos Demetrakopoulos, Προσθήκαι καὶ διορθώσεις εἰς τὴν Νεοελληνικὴν Φιλολογίαν Κωνσταντίνου Σάθα. Leipzig, 1871.

Demetrakopoulos, Epanorthoseis.

Andronikos Demetrakopoulos, Ἐπανορθώσεις σφαλμάτων ἐν τῇ Νεοελληνικῇ Φιλολογίᾳ Κωνσταντίνου Σάθα μετὰ καὶ τινων προσηκόντων. Leipzig, 1872.

ΕΑ. Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια.

ΕΕ. Ἑπαιρωτικὴ Ἑστία.

ΕCH. Ἑπαιρωτικὰ Χρονικά.

ΕΕBS. Ἑπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν.

ΕMA. Ἑπετηρὶς Μισσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχαίου.

ΕΡ. Ἑπετηρὶς Παρνασσῶ.

ΕPH. Ἑκκλησιαστικὸς Φῶρος.

Dictionnaire.

Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastiques.

Gedeon, ΕΑ.

Manouel Gedeon, "Ἐπισημείωσις συμπληροῦσα τὰ περὶ τῶν μητροπολιτῶν Βιζύης καὶ Μηδείας," ΕΑ, III (1883), 417-22.

Gedeon, Ephemerides

Manouel Gedeon, Πατριαρχικαὶ ἡμερίδες. Εἰδήσεις ἀκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας, 1500-1812. Athens, 1936.

Gedeon, Pinakes

Manouel Gedeon. Πατριαρχικοὶ Ποίνakes. Constantinople, 1890.

Germanos VI.

Metropolitan Germanos of Sardes, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καὶ Δυτικῆς Θράκης, Θρακικά, VI (1935), pp. 37-136.

Germanos, VIII.

Metropolitan Germanos of Sardes, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τῆς Βορείου Θράκης καὶ ἐν γένει τῆς Βουλγαρίας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως καὶ ἐξῆς, Θρακικά, VIII (1937), pp. 110-89.

Germanos, ΕCH.

Metropolitan Germanos of Sardes, Ἐπισκοπικοὶ Κατάλογοι τῶν ἐν Ἑπείρῳ καὶ Ἀλβανίᾳ ἐπαρχιῶν τοῦ Πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Ἑπαιρωτικὰ Χρονικά, XII (1937), 11-103.

Germanos, Orthodoxia.

Germanos, Metropolitan of Sardes, " Συμβολή εἰς τοὺς Πατρι-
αρχικοὺς καταλόγους Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως καὶ
ἐξῆς", **Ὁρθοδοξία**, VIII (1933), pp. 252-53, 279-85, 312-20,
345-54, IX (1934), pp. 30-37, 74-82, 118-28, 175-84, 212-
20, 251-58, 304-11, 319-27, 355-63, 429-38, 487-96, 517-25,
X (1935), pp. 26-34, 94-100, 127-34, 166-73, 191-200,
233-43, 293-301, 310-20, 356-65, 411-18, *ibid.*, XI (1936),
pp. 37-45, 86-95, 138-45, 167-73, 198-207, 240-247, 263-71,
337-44, 368-78.

Giannopoulos, EP., XIV.

N. I. Giannopoulos, " Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι Θεσσαλίας,"
Ἑπετηρὶς Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου Παρνασσός, XIV (1914),
253-312.

Giannopoulos, Theologia., XIII.

N. I. Giannopoulos, " Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι Θεσσαλίας,"
Θεολογία XIII (1935), 22-36, 125-29.

Gritsopoulos, Archeion, XVIII.

Tasos Gritsopoulos, " Συμβολή εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἱστορί-
αν τῆς Ραιδεστοῦ," **Ἀρχαῖον Θρακικοῦ Λαογραφικοῦ Θησαυ-
ροῦ**, XVIII (1953), 179-92.

Gritsopoulos, Archeion, XIX.

Tasos Gritsopoulos, " Συμβολή εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν Ἱστορίαν
Φιλιππουπόλεως κατὰ τὸν 12' αἰῶνα," *ibid.*, XIX (1954),
265-81.

Gritsopoulos, Archeion, XXI.

Tasos Gritsopoulos " Σελίδες τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Ση-
λυβρίας," *ibid.*, XXI (1956), 114-26.

Gritsopoulos, Korinthos.

Tasos Gritsopoulos **Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία καὶ Χριστιανικὰ
μνημεῖα Κορινθίας**. Athens, 1973.

Gritsopoulos, Mone Philosophou.

Tasos Gritsopoulos, **Μονὴ Φιλσοσόφου**. Athens, 1960.

Gritsopoulos, Theologia, XXIX

Tasos Gritsopoulos, " Κύριλλας Γ' Σπανὸς ὁ ἐπιβάτης τοῦ Οἰ-
κουμενικοῦ Θρόνου," **Θεολογία**, XXIX (1958), 407-17.

GP. Γρηγόριος Παλαμάς.

Kampouroglou.

Demetrios Kampouroglou, **Μνημεία τῆς ἱστορίας τῶν Ἀθηνῶν.**
2 vols. Athens, 1890.

Kourilas,

Eulogios Kourilas, "Βιογραφικὰς κατάλογος Μητροπολιτῶν
Ἑρακλείας," **Θρακικά**, XXVIII (1958), 3-279.

Lampros, DIEE, II.

Spyridon Lampros, "Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Παπᾶ Συνοδινοῦ,"
Deltion, II (1885), 640-50.

Legrand, Bibliographie.

Emile Legrand, **Bibliographie hellenique, ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au XVII^e siècle.** 4 vols. Paris, 1894-1903.

Mystakides, Katalogoi

Vasileios Mystakides, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ Κατάλογοι,"
Ed. G. Konidares. **EEBS**, XII (1936), pp. 139-206.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekta

A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus. **Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμικῆς Σταχυολογίας.** 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1891-1898.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Katalogos.

A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus. "Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ Συλλόγῳ χειρογράφων βιβλίων," **Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος.** Supplement, XX-XXII (1892), 76-130.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke

A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, **Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἢ Κατάλογος τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου Θρόνου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ πόλεως Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων ἑλληνικῶν κωδίκων.** 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1891.

Patrineles, EMA, III.

Chestos Patrineles, "Πατριαρχικὰ γράμματα ... ἐκ τοῦ Κώδικος τοῦ Ἱερακός," **EMA**, XII (1962), 116-65.

Pennas, Historia.

Petros Pennas, **Ἱστορία τῶν Σερρῶν.** Athens, 1966.

Petit, Echos d' Orient.

Louis Petit. "Les évêques de Thessalonique," *Echos d' Orient*, V (1901-02), 150-56, 212-19, 226-33, 290-97.

Phougias, Historia.

Methodios Phougias, *Ἱστορία τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Κερύνθου*. Athens, 1968.

Sathas.

Konstantinos Sathas. *Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*. Vol. III. Venice, 1872.

Stamoules, EMA.

S. Stamoules, "Συμβολὴ εἰς τοὺς καταλόγους τῶν ἐπισκόπων Βεροίας καὶ Ναούσης," *EMA*, XII (1962-65).

Stamoules, Thrakika, XIV.

M. Stamoules, "Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς Θράκης," *Θρακικά* XIV (1940), 7-286.

TCE. Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Χριστιανικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία.

TEE. Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία.

Vaporis, Codex Gamma

N. M. Vaporis, *Codex (Γ') Gamma of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople*. Brookline, 1974.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Asper (Greek, aspron; Turkish akce), an Ottoman silver coin.

Bakion (a), overdue fees owing from the zetia.

Charatsi (Turkish, kharadj), poll-tax paid by Christians to the Ottoman state.

Eleemosyne, literally, charity; here irregular fees paid to the Patriarchate.

Emvatikion(a), fee paid to the hierarch by clergymen at the time of their appointment.

Epitropos, a representative.

Etesion, an annual fee paid to the Patriarchate by hierarchs.

Grosia (Turkish, kuruş), an Ottoman gold dollar.

Hagiasmoi, fee paid to hierarch for blessing services.

Hierarch(s), one of episcopal rank: metropolitan, archbishop, or bishop.

Kanonikon, fee paid by each family and clergyman to the hierarch.

Load, equals 100,000 aspers.

Menologema(ta), an elaborate inscription of the date, month and indiction, used on patriarchal documents.

Monokondylion, usually refers to the elaborate inscription of patriarchal titles in documents; literally, written without lifting the pen from the paper. For the Patriarch of Constantinople: (N) Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch.

Offikia (officia), ecclesiastical offices in the Church of Constantinople and other hierarchical sees. In the Patriarchate the most important offices, beginning in the seventeenth century, are held by laymen.

Panegyria, literally feast day celebrations; here fee paid to the ecclesiastical head upon the occasion of such a celebration.

Peskesion, initiated in 1467; a tax paid by each patriarch to the Sultan upon the former's election. Later paid to each new Sultan as well.

Synoikesia, fees due to the hierarch from marriage contracts.

Tzoulousion, fee paid by hierarchs to the Patriarchate.

Voetheia, fee paid by hierarchs to the Patriarchate.

Zetia (zeteia), an irregular fee imposed upon hierarchs by the Patriarchate to help pay the general indebtedness of the Church. The amount varied with the debt.

TABLE OF THE REGESTA

- No. 1. (108) Patriarchal Letter: Restoration of Kassandria to Thessalonike Oct. / Nov. 1612
- No. 2. (105,53) Deposition of Loukas of HOUNGROVLACHIA (Wal-lachia) Sept. 1615
- No. 3. (106) Deposition of Loukas of HOUNGROVLACHIA Sept. 1615
- No. 4. (103,52) Confession of Faith: Kallistos of Lemnos Aug. 1616
- No. 5. (107,54) Election: Makarios of HOUNGROVLACHIA 2 Sept. 1616
- No. 6. (104) Exoneration: Klemes of Lemnos Dec. 1616
- No. 7. (22) Patriarchal Letter: Elevation of Zetounion & Pteleon. June 1617
- No. 8. (6) Invalidation of an Election: Hieremias of Kitros Nov. 1617
- No. 9. (19,10) Election: Longinos of Synada 6 May 1618
- No. 10. (15,8) Election: Kyrillos of Verroia 12 Aug. 1618
- No. 11. (17,9) Election: Gennadios of Kapha & Phoula Aug. 1618
- No. 12. (5,3) Election: Hieremias of Selyvria 18 Nov. 1618
- No. 13. (21,11) Resignation: Neophytos of Zetounion & Ptelion 26 June 1619
- No. 14. (20) Election: Ioasaph of Zetounion & Pteleon June 1619
- No. 15. (8) Resignation: Symeon of Pogoniane 23 Feb. 1620
- No. 16. (9,5) Election: Gregorios of Larissa May 1620
- No. 17. (10) Resignation: Timotheos of Chalkedon May 1620
- No. 18. (11,6) Election: Ioseph of Chalkedon June 1620
- No. 19. (12) Resignation: Sophronios of Vidyna 16 June 1620
- No. 20. (13,7) Election: Euthymios of Vidyna June 1620
- No. 21. (23,12) Election: Kyrillos (I) of Constantinople 4 Nov. 1620
- No. 22. (25,13) Election: Gerasimos of Alexandria 30 Nov. 1620

- No. 23.(26) Confession of Faith: Gerasimos of Alexandria
Nov. 1620
- No. 24. (28,29) Patriarchal Indebtedness: Kyrillos I 1 Dec. 1620
- No. 25. (32) Resignation: Gabriel of Methymna 1 Feb. 1620
- No. 26. (33,17) Election: Ioasaph of Domenikon & Elasson
Dec. 1621
- No. 27. (35,18) Election: Akakios of Mesemvria Jan. 1622
- No. 28. (40) Resignation: Ioseph of Paronaxia 1 Feb. 1622
- No. 29. (41,21) Election: Hieremias of Paronaxia 1 Feb. 1622
- No. 30. (37,19) Election: Neophytos of Heraklia 2 Feb. 1622
- No. 31. (38) Confession of Faith: Neophytos of Heraklia
Feb. 1622
- No. 32. (44) A Petition: Christians of Korinth May 1622
- No. 33. (45,23) Election: Neophytos of Korinth May 1622
- No. 34. (42) Provisional Exoneration: Ioasaph of Zetounion
June 1622
- No. 35. (43,22) Election: Ioasaph of Euripos June 1622
- No. 36. (47,24) Patriarchal Indebtedness: Kyrillos I July 1624
- No. 37. (49,25) Deposition of Neophytos of Korinth July 1624
- No. 38. (51,26) Election: Daniel of Korinth Sept. 1624
- No. 39. (52) Confession of Faith: Daniel of Korinth Sept. 1624
- No. 40. (90) Election: Averkios of Philippi & Drama Jan. 1625
- No. 41. (91,46) Deposition of Ioasaph of Chalkedon May 1625
- No. 42. (89,45) Election: Pachomios of Rhodes Dec. 1625
- No. 43. (92) Election: Gregorios of Chalkedon 24 Mar. 1626
- No. 44. (54) Election: Makarios of Tornovo 18 Apr. 1626
- No. 45. (55,28) Confession of Faith: Makarios of Tornovo
Apr. 1626
- No. 46. (56) Election: Achilleios of Serres 26 Apr. 1626
- No. 47. (82) Excommunication: Athanasios Patelarios Apr. 1634
- No. 48. (99,100, 50) Excommunication: Athanasios Patelarios
Apr. 1634
- No. 49. (101-02, 51) Encyclical Letter: Kyrillos I Apr. 1634
- No. 50. (83,42) Patriarchal Declaration: Kyrillos II May 1635
- No. 51. (83b-86, 42-43) Financial Committee: Kyrillos I
May 1635

- No. 52. (93,47) Deposition: Ioasaph of Domenikon & Elasson
1/5 Mar. 1636**
- No. 53. (94) Election: Kallistos of Domenikon & Elasson
6 Mar. 1636**
- No. 54. (95,48) Confession of Faith: Kallistos of Domenikon &
Elasson Mar. 1636**
- No. 55. (3,2) Confirmation: Monastery of All Saints Apr. 1636**
- No. 56. (87,44) Patriarchal Indebtedness: Kyrillos II May / June
1636**
- No. 57. (97,98, 49) Condemnation of Heresy: Kyrillos II 1638**
- No. 58. (61,64, 31-32) Deposition of Kyrillos II ca. July 1639**
- No. 59. (65,33) Election: Parthenios I of Constantinople
1 July 1639**
- No. 60. (67,34) Election: Parthenios of Adrianople 7 July 1639**
- No. 61. (69-35) Election: Kallinikos of Ioannina 7 July 1639**
- No. 62. (71,36) Resignation: Igantios of Sophia 19 Sept. 1640**
- No. 63. (74) Deposition: Anthimos of Trapezous 1640**
- No. 64. (76) Deposition: Ioasaph of Korinth Jan. 1641**
- No. 65. (77,39) Election: Theophanes of Old Patras Feb. 1641**
- No. 66. (57,29) Election: Damaskenos of Mesemvria 1/22 July
1641**
- No. 67. (79,40) Deposition: Kallinikos of Ioannina Oct. 1643**
- No. 68. (59-60, 30) Tax Exemption: Gabriel of Skyros
ca. Dec. 1646**

1 (108, 4)

PATRIARCHAL LETTER

Synodikon gramma

Patriarch Timotheos II¹

[October or November 1612]

Metropolitan Paisios of Thessalonike² petitions for and is granted the return of the Archdiocese of Kassandria³ which had been "unjustly detached" from the Metropolis of Thessalonike by Patriarch Neophytos II.⁴ Consequently, Kassandria loses its archdiocesan rank and its bishop will henceforth be ordained by the metropolitan of Thessalonike to whom the charatsi (kharadj) is to be paid.

Monokondylion

The end portion of the document is missing, hence there is no date or signatures. The date is Papadopoulos-Kerameus'; see his *Vivliotheke* IV, 21. Gedeon (*Pinakes*, p. 551) dates the document July 1622 under Patriarch Kyrillos I. However, the name of Patriarch Timotheos II is very clear in the text. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus; *Vivliotheke*, IV, 21.

1. Patriarch from Oct./Nov. 1612-3 Sept. 1620; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, X, 359. For a short biography of Patriarch Timotheos II, see Vaporis, *Codex Gamma*, No. 46.

2. In the MS: Oct./Nov. 1612-July 1624; Nos. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 22, 24, 32, 36, 37.

Inclusive dates: May 1608; Sept. 1609-1629.

Paisios is unknown to Alexoudes (*Leukoma*, p. 183), Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, p. 176), Konidares (*TCE*, III, 1045), and to Tzogas (*TEE*, VI, 461. Following Alexoudes, they all record Parthenios in 1611. But Parthenios did not exist as demonstrated by L. Petit (*Echos d' Orient*, V, 154-55) over seventy years ago. However, Paisios is attested by Papadopoulos-Kerameus (*Vivliotheke*, IV,

11, 13, 21 and *Analekta*, IV, 93, 94, 96) although he erroneously listed Porphyrios on 6 May 1618 (*Vivliotheke*, IV, 10) instead of Paisios. Later, Paisios is attested by Arampatzoglou (*Photieios*, I, xii, n 13), by Germanos (*Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 487) where Paisios is one of the hierarchs responsible for the election of Patriarch Timotheos II, by Gritsopoulos ("Πατριαρχικά γράμματα ὑπὲρ τῆς Μονῆς τοῦ Φιλοσόφου," *EEBS* (1956), pp. 201, 215), and by Ateses, I, 424.

In addition, Paisios is attested on May 1608 (*Codex Alpha*, pp. 54, 56) and from Sept. 1609-Oct. 1624 in *ibid.*, pp. 34, 39, 50-51, 45, 48, 66, 70, 49, 495, 96-97, 102-03, 106-07, 155, 143. Petit (*Echos d' Orient*, V, 155) attests him as late as 1629.

3. The diocese of Kassandria was detached from Thessalonike and raised to archdiocesan rank in December 1607 when Bishop Euthymios was deposed by Metropolitan Zosimas of Thessalonike and this act was confirmed by Patriarch Raphael II (1603-1607). Hieromonk Damaskenos was then elected archbishop of the new archdiocese. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 81; Sathas, p. 555.

But the patriarchal decision was not apparently implemented immediately, for in Dec. 1620, Patriarch Kyrillos I Loukaris issued a ruling declaring Kassandria a diocese of Thessalonike (Sathas, p. 561). The same patriarch issued a similar ruling on 17 July 1624, stating once more that Kassandria belonged to Thessalonike and that Metropolitan Paisios (in whose presence the ruling was issued) would ordain the next bishop of Kassandria after the death of the then incumbent Sisoës (see *Codex Alpha*, p. 155). The document also cites the ruling of Patriarch Timotheos II but not that of Dec. 1620. The ruling of 17 July 1624 is erroneously dated by Sathas June 1624 (p. 564) and June 1625 by Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 554. According to Patriarch Athanasios (see above No. 35), in a letter dated 20 Feb. 1640, the uneven history of Kassandria was due to the antipathy of Patriarch Kyrillos I for Metropolitan Paisios of Thessalonike. But the rulings of Kyrillos I, cited above cast doubt on this interpretation. For Athanasios' letter see Konstantinos Mertzios, *Thessalonike*, 1947), pp. 509-10.

4. Elected, beginning Feb. 1602-middle Jan. 1603; 15 Oct. 1607-Oct. 1612; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, X (1935), p. 359.

Neophytos was Metropolitan of Athens when he was elected Ecumenical Patriarch. His first term was brief; he was expelled and exiled to the island of Rhodes by Sultan Mehemed III (1595-

1605) through action initiated by Patriarch Matthaïos II who both preceded and followed Neophytos as patriarch.

Matthaïos II's third tenure lasted for a few days between the month of January and February 1603 when he was replaced by Patriarch Raphael II (Feb. 1603-first half of Oct. 1607). Neophytos' conduct on Rhodes was so reprehensible, he was accused of misappropriation of church funds, that Raphael II continued the efforts of Matthaïos II and Neophytos was removed to Mount Sinai and confined there. From Mount Sinai Neophytos succeeded in moving to Mount Athos which brought him closer to Constantinople. In the capital, his friends succeeded in getting him elected a second time on 15 Oct. 1607. His second tenure lasted for five years, that is, until Oct. 1612 when he was expelled and was ordered exiled to Rhodes once more.

It appears that Neophytos' conduct did not change much during his second patriarchate but he continued to perpetrate injustices; he practiced nepotism, and ruled in a rather tyrannical fashion. Moreover, Neophytos befriended the Jesuits, an act which caused Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris, then Patriarch of Alexandria, together with others, to work towards his expulsion.

But Neophytos avoided exile, because after one month as administrator of the Patriarchate (Oct. 1612) Kyrillos Loukaris was replaced by Timotheos II (end Oct./Nov. 1612-3 Sept. 1620) who was a friend of Neophytos. It is believed that he returned to Constantinople where he died. See Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 355-60; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 542-43, 545-47; and Arampatzoglou, *Photieios*, I, 6-8.

2 (105, 53)

DEPOSITION

Kathairesis

Patriarch Timotheos II

September 7124 [1615], Indiction [14]¹

Metropolitan Loukas of Houngrovlachia [Wallachia]² is deposed and unfrocked for being insubordinate, prodigal, and unresponsive to his financial obligations (etesion and voetheia)³ owed to the Patriarchate.

This action is taken with the participation of Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem.⁴

†Paisios of Thessalonike, †Achilleios of Monemvasia,⁵ †Gabriel of Gangra,⁶ †Hieremias of Kitros,⁷ †Daniel of Didymoteichon,⁸ †Neophytos of Kerasous,⁹ †Laurentios, formerly of Vizya¹⁰

Monokondylion. Menologema.

Text: Delikanēs, III, 280-81. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 21. He does not record Paisios of Thessalonike, Daniel of Didymoteichon, and Laurentios, formerly of Vizya, while Delikanēs omits Neophytos of Kerasous.

1. The document is dated 7124 and the *menologema* reads September, Indiction 15. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (*Vivliotheke*, IV, 21) dates the document, September 7124 (1615). He must have believed that the Indiction was wrong (Indiction 15=1616) and the month and year correct. I have followed his dating. Delikanēs (III, 280-81), who erroneously places the document on p. 108 of the MS, dates the document September 7124, Indiction 14 and erroneously calculates this to be 1616 instead of 1615.

2. Inclusive dates: 1603-Sept. 1615, deposed. However, despite the deposition and the election of Metropolitan Makarios, formerly of Ganos & Chora, to succeed him, it appears that Loukas held on to his see until his death in 1629.

For a brief account of Loukas, who was a native of Cyprus,

see Gheorghe Cront, "Le Chypriote Luca, Evêque et Métropolitte en Valachie (1583-1629)," Πρακτικά τοῦ Πρώτου Διεθνoῦς Κυπριο-ολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου," III, A (1973), pp. 45-47 and N. Serbanescu, "Metropolitii Ungrovlachiei," Biserica Ortodoxa Româna, LXXVII (1959), pp. 768-70.

3. Episcopal taxes (contributions) paid to the Patriarchate by the hierarchs.

4. Patriarch Theophanes III of Jerusalem served from 1609-1644. For a brief biography, see Gritsopoulos, Mone Philosophou, pp. 249-64.

5. In the MS: Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616; Nos. 2, 5, 6.

Inclusive dates: 1 June 1614-before Dec. 1616. Gritsopoulos (TEE, IX, 45) lists Achilleios from 1614-1617 as does Ateses, II, 131, but he is cited as former in Dec. 1616; see below No. 6; Gabriel Stavroniketianos "Σιγγάλιον τοῦ Πατριάρχου Τιμοθέου Α'," GP, IV (1920), 741.

6. In the MS: Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616; Nos. 3, 5, 6.

Inclusive dates: Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616. Gabriel is also attested in May and June 1616; see Codex Alpha, pp. 74, 77, 82, 83 and 87. But I have not been able to find a list for Gangra to compare my findings.

7. In the MS: Sept. 1615-Nov. 1618; Nos. 2, 5, 6, 8, 11.

Inclusive dates: ca. 24 May 1613-Nov. 1617, election invalidated. Nevertheless, Hieremias signed as Bishop of Kitros in Aug. 1618; see below No. 11.

Gedeon (Ephemerides, p. 175) cites Hieremias' predecessor, also named Hieremias, on 24 May 1613 as former. Janin (Dictionnaire, XII, 999) cites Hieremias only in Nov. 1617, while Ateses (I, 462) and Metropolitan Varnavas (TEE, VII, 599) omit both bishops named Hieremias.

8. In the MS: Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616; Nos. 2, 5, 6.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 23 June 1606-May 1608; Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616.

It is difficult to sort out the metropolitans who served Didymoteichon between 15 Sept. 1596 and Dec. 1616. Ioasaph is attested from 15 Sept. 1596-23 July 1606 when he is cited as having resigned; Janin, Dictionnaire, XIV, 428; Germanos, VI, 70. Ph. Vapheides ("Κατάλογος ἐπισκόπων καὶ Μητροπολιτῶν τῆς πόλεως Διδυμοτείχου" GP, VII (1923), p. 197), Anastasiou

(TEE, IV, 1209), and Ateses, I, 144 attest Ioasaph only from 1605-1606.

Ioasaph was followed by Daniel, elected 23 July 1606—he had been Metropolitan of Ainos. Daniel is also attested in May 1608; see *Codex Alpha*, p. 26 and Germanos, VI, 71. Many difficulties could be eliminated if we could extend Daniel's tenure to Dec. 1616 (see below No. 6), but there is an Ioasaph attested from Mar. 1611-July 1613; *Codex Alpha*, pp. 45, 50-51, 63, 64; Germanos, VI, 71; and EutrataDES, "Ἱστορικὰ Μνημεῖα τοῦ Ἀθῶ", III (1930), 50. I therefore agree with Vapheides, Germanos, Anastasiou, and Ateses who record two Daniels and two Ioasaphs—but not with their dates—as against Janin who more or less accepts only one Ioasaph and one Daniel from "23 June 1606-? (Sept. 1616)."

Perhaps the order is something like this: Ioasaph 15 Sept. 1596-26 Feb. 1606, resigned. (He is attested as former metropolitan Sept. 1609-July 1610.) Daniel, elected 23 June 1606-May 1608; Ioasaph, March 1611-July 1613; Daniel, Sept. 1615-Dec. 1616.

9. In the MS: Sept. 1615. Nos. 2, 3.

Inclusive dates; as *proedros*: 1613-Mar. 1621. Neophytos was formerly Metropolitan of Ganos & Chora (Germanos, VI, 58), elected in 1610. In Jan. 1613 Makarios, who was elected Ganos & Chora in 1601 and was deposed in 1609, returned at which time Neophytos became *proedros* of Kerasous.

Neophytos does not frequently sign as *proedros* but usually omitted the designation. This is true above as well as in No. 3 and in *Codex Alpha*, pp. 98-99 (Mar. 1621). In *ibid.*, p. 67b, he signed: "Neophytos, formerly of Ganos and *proedros* of Kerasous," (1613). Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 155) only attests Neophytos in 1613.

10. In the MS: Sept. 1615-Aug. 1618; Nos. 2, 5, 6, 11. During the above dates, Laurentios was the former Metropolitan of Vizya.

Inclusive dates: June 1614-before Sept. 1615; *Codex Alpha*, p. 87; Germanos (VI, 54), Sathas (p. 560), Gedeon ("Ἐπισημεῖωσις συμπληροῦσα τὰ περὶ μητροπόλεως Βυζύης καὶ Μηδείας," EA, III (1882-1883), 418), Janin (*Dictionnaire*, IX 45), Gritsopoulos (TEE, III, 890), and Stamoules (*Thrakika*, XIV, 92) all attest Laurentios only in 1616.

According to the election certificate (*Codex Alpha*, p. 87;

Germanos, VI, 54), dated 1 June 1616, Bishop Anthimos of Tyrouloe & Serentzia succeeded Laurentios, who is cited there as former and who also signs Anthimos' election certificate. But in a sigillion issued by Patriarch Timotheos II, dated 11 May 1616 and addressed to the Monastery of Zoodochos Pege on the island of Andros, Anthimos signs as the Metropolitan of Vizya while Laurentios signs as the former metropolitan; see **Codex Alpha**, p. 75. Laurentios is also attested in the same source as former in June 1616 in two other documents, pp. 82, 83. To make matters a bit more confusing, on p. 77, dated May 1616, Laurentios' name appears without the qualification former. This I believe is an omission on the part of the copiest because all the signatures are of one hand. Furthermore, Laurentios' personal autographed resignation is dated June 1616 (p. 82).

I believe with Germanos (VI, 54) that Laurentios effectively resigned before his written resignation of June 1616, that is, some time before Sept. 1615 (Germanos strangely missed the above document) and that although Anthimos' election certificate was not officially signed until 1 June 1616, he had been acting as the Metropolitan of Vizya from at least as early as 11 May 1616.

3 (106, 53)

DEPOSITION

Kathairesis

Patriarch Timotheos II

September 7124 [1615], Indiction [14]

Text is identical with that in No. 2 above.

†Paisios of Thessalonike, †Gabriel of Gangra, †Neophytos of Kerasous

Monokondylon. Menologema.

There are two menologemata in the document: September, Indiction 15 and March, Indiction 13.

Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 21, but no signatures.

4 (103, 52)

CONFESSION OF FAITH

Homologia pisteos

Patriarch Timotheos II

August [7124, 1616, Indiction 14]¹

The confession of faith² of Kallistos, Metropolitan elect of Lemnos.

†Kallistos, by the grace of God, candidate for the office of Metropolitan of Lemnos³

Menologema

The first and largest part of the confession is missing. There is another menologema: May, Indiction 1 below the text which seems unrelated to the confession, but misled Papadopoulos-Kerameus in his dating.

Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 20. He dates the document in May without the year.

1. Date based on the menologema and on events below in No. 6.

2. For hierarchical confessions of faith, see the study of Metropolitan Kallinikos of Verroia, "Περὶ τῆς ὁμολογίας τῶν χειροτονουμένων ἀρχιερέων τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου," *GP*, II (1918), 60-77.

3. In the MS: Aug.-Dec. 1616; Nos. 4, 6.

Inclusive dates: Elected, Aug. 1616-Dec. 1616, cited as dead. Ateses (I, 485) lists Kallistos "?-1616" and believes he was transferred from Synada. He does not know Kallistos' election or death. Also see below No. 6, n. 1.

5 (107, 54)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

2 September 7125 [1616], Indiction 15

Metropolitan Makarios, formerly of Ganos & Chora,¹ is elected Metropolitan of Houn grovlachia² to succeed Loukas who was deposed.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Ignatios the Protosynkelos and Hieromonk Anthimos the Protosynkelos

†Paisios of Thessalonike, †Achilleios of Monemvasia, †Gabriel of Gangra, †Laurentios, formerly of Vizya, †Daniel of Didymoteichon, †Hieremias of Kitros Menologema.⁴

Text: Delikanes, III, 281-82. Delikanes erroneously dates the document: September 7125 [1617], Indiction 15.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 21 but without signatories. Cited: Gritsopoulos, *Archeion*, XXI, 116. He also corrects the date. See too, Germanos, VI, 56.

1. In the MS: 2 Sept. 1616-June 1620; Nos. 5, 9, 16, 18, 20.

Inclusive dates (as Ganos & Chora): Elected, 1601-Sept. 1609, cited as former; Jan. 1613-1616, expelled.

Makarios was Grand Protosynkelos of the Patriarchate when he was elected Metropolitan of Ganos & Chora in 1601. His deposition in 1609 was for "many and various crimes." He is not listed by Athenagoras (EEBS). Both Germanos (VI, 58, n2) and Patrinoles (TEE, IV, 231) date Makarios' first deposition in 1610. But Makarios is already cited as former in Sept. 1609. See *Codex Alpha*, p. 39. He is listed to 1610 by Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 99.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 2 Sept. 1616. Although Makarios was elected Metropolitan of Houn grovlachia (Wallachia) to succeed Loukas, he did not actually take possession of this see. His trip to the Danubian Principality proved fruitless. See above No. 2.

Makarios was deposed again in May 1624; Germanos, VI, 58, n2.

3. See above No. 4.

4. There are two *menologemata* in the document: December, Indiction 10 and August, Indiction 7. Neither is related to the text.

6 (104, 52)

EXONERATION

Katholike athoosis

Patriarch Timotheos II

December 7125 [1616], Indiction 15

Metropolitan Klemes of Lemnos¹ appeared before the Holy Synod and convinced its members of his innocence of the charges brought against him by people of his province. He is therefore declared acquitted of any wrong doing, and is consequently restored to his metropolis whose clergy and laity are to pay him the respect and honor due him as the legal and canonical hierarch. Moreover, he is to receive the various revenues of his see: the clergy fee (*kanonikon*), marriage fees (*synoikesia*), festival or feast day fees (*panegyria*), the *zetia*, and others peculiar to the metropolis. Anyone who opposes this decision, clergy or lay, will suffer ecclesiastical punishment.

Klemes had been charged by patriarchal letter, delivered by Bishop Pophyrios of Servia,² to appear before the Holy Synod to answer charges four months prior to the above date. He did not, and he was consequently deposed and succeeded by Kallistos.³ Later, Klemes did appear in person and declared that his failure to appear earlier was not due to disobedience or insubordination, but to fear of the danger and threats made by the civil authorities (*exousia*). His restoration was also facilitated by the death of Kallistos.

†Porphyrios of Nikaia,⁴ †Paisios of Thessalonike, †Gabriel of Nikomedia,⁵ †Timotheos of Chalkedon,⁶ †Gabriel of Tornovo,⁷ †Theophanes of Athens,⁸ †Theophanes of Old Patras,⁹ who signs for Anthimos of Korinth,¹⁰ and Neophytos of Drama,¹¹ †Metropha-

nes of Monemvasia,¹² †Timotheos of Serres,¹³ †Gabriel of Gangra, †Gregorios of Tserveno.¹⁴ [†Gregorios?] of Preslava,¹⁵ †Hieremias of Kitros, †Laurentios, formerly of Vizya, [†Achilleios], formerly of Monemvasia, †Neophytos of Metra [& Athyra],¹⁶ †Grand Logothetes of the Great Church [George?]¹⁷ who signs for Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem, Timotheos of Larissa,¹⁸ [. . .] of Thebes,¹⁹ Ioasaph of Prousa,²⁰ Nikephoros of Paronaxia,²¹ and Makarios of Imvros,²² †Grand Rhetor of the Great Church [Michael]²³ who signs for Gabriel of Ephesos,²⁴ Gabriel of Naupaktos & Arta,²⁵ Konstantios of Mitylene,²⁶ Sophronios of Vidyna,²⁷ and [Daniel] of Didymoteichon.

Monokondylion. Menologema.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 20-21. He omits Neophytos of Drama and all the names that appear above in brackets.

1. In the MS: Dec. 1616-Nov. 1618; Nos. 6, 8.

Inclusive dates: 6 Apr. 1610-Aug. 1616, deposed; restored, Dec. 1616-? Initial date in *Codex Alpha*, p. 40.

In his initial study, Ateses (*Lemnos*, 28) did not include the interruption of Klemes' tenure by Kallistos. In *AEKD*, XII (1957), p. 85 and in *TEE*, VIII, 287, he lists Klemes from "1610-1621?" In Ateses I, 485 the listing changed to "1610-?" and "1616-?" with Kallistos from "?-1616."

2. Inclusive dates: unknown. Porphyrios is unknown to Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, XI, 98.

3. See above No. 4.

4. In the MS: Dec. 1616-1 July 1639; Nos. 6, 8, 22, 24, 51, 59.

Inclusive dates: Jan. 1612-June 1640, cited as having resigned; Sathas, p. 375; Chamoudopoulos, *EA*, II, 697. For attestations prior to 1624, see *Codex Alpha*, pp. 66 (Jan. 1612), 162-63 (Mar. 1622), 128 (19 June 1623), 122-23 (25 June 1623), 125-26 (July 1623), 137, 130 (Aug. 1623), 165 (Sept. 1623). Konstantinides (*TEE*, IX, 459) and Alexoudes (*Leukoma*, 109) list Porphyrios from 1624-1640.

5. Inclusive dates: July 1610-ca. June 1617. Gabriel's initial attestation in *Codex Alpha*, p. 36b; see also p. 78, dated Dec.

1616 and No. 7 below. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (**Katalogos**, p. 98) also lists Gabriel in Sept. 1610 and in May 1611, while Eustratiades (**Hellenika**, III, 48), Konstantinides (**TEE**, IX, 543), and Alexoudes (**Leukoma**, 109) list him only in 1611.

6. In the MS: Dec. 1616-June 1620; Nos. 6, 17, 18.

Inclusive dates: May 1593-May 1620, resigned. Returned, 1622-before 1623 when Ioasaph was elected; see Arampatzoglou, **Orthodoxia**, XIX (1944), 74. V. Stavrides (**TEE**, XII, 54) does not record Timotheos' return, nor does Alexoudes (**Leukoma**, p. 110), Janin, **Dictionnaire**, XII, 275.

Timotheos' tenure was also interrupted at least in June 1617 by Hieremias (see below No. 7). Also noted by Stavrides but not by Arampatzoglou, who believes Papadopoulos-Kerameus erred in his reading of Hieremias. The name, however, is quite clear in the MS.

7. In the MS: Dec. 1616-18 Apr. 1626; Nos. 6, 8, 37, 45.

Inclusive dates: Mar. 1613-18 Apr. 1626, cited as dead; Germanos, VII, 179. Alexoudes (**Leukoma**, 183) records Gabriel only in 1620.

8. In the MS: Dec. 1616-July 1624; Nos. 6, 8, 32, 33, 36, 37.

Inclusive dates: Jan. 1612-9 Dec. 1633 when Sophronios was elected and he is cited as dead. My inclusive dates are in agreement only with Soteriou (**TEE**, I, 668), while Janin (**Dictionnaire**, V, 41), Atheses (I, 144), Anonymous (**TEE**, I, 704) list Theophanes from 1620-1633. They also list a Kyrillos "ca. 1619" during Theophanes' tenure. But see **Codex Alpha**, p. 86, dated Jan. 1612, where Theophanes signs as Metropolitan of Athens, while Anthimos signs as the former metropolitan.

9. In the MS: Dec. 1616-26 Apr. 1626; Nos. 6, 8, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46.

Inclusive dates: 1612-2 Mar. 1638, resigned; **Codex Alpha**, p. 340b. Gritsopoulos (**Mone Philosophou**, 380) dates Theophanes' resignation in Aug. 1638. He takes his date from Dositheos' **Nomike Synagoge** where the copiest apparently misread the Mar. 2 notation following Theophanes' signature.

Previous to his election, Theophanes had served as Metropolitan of Serres, 1602-1612. For Theophanes' biographical details see Gritsopoulos, **Mone Philosophou**, 374-81.

10. In the MS: Dec. 1616-May 1622; Nos. 6, 16, 21, 22, 32,

Inclusive dates: 1601-between Nov. 1620 and sometime in Dec.

1620, deposed; restored, 1620-May 1622 when he is cited as deposed for a second time.

In Dec. 1620, Anthimos was declared to be innocent of the charge of being responsible for the death of Dionysios of Lakadaimonia; see below No. 32 and Gritsopoulos, *Korinthos*, pp. 234-37 for a discussion of Anthimos' career.

Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XIII, 858) and Konstantinides (*TEE*, VII, 858) attest Anthimos from 1601-1616 and from 1620-1622. They also cite Athanasios in May 1620, as does Phougias, *Korinthos*, 238-39. However, Anthimos is attested in May 1620 (see below No. 16) and on 30 Nov. 1620 (*Codex Alpha*, pp. 102-03). The citation of Athanasios is due to Papadopoulos-Kerameus (*Vivliotheke*, IV, 8, my No. 16 below) who, I believe, read Athanasios for Anthimos. Anthimos' signatures in Nos. 16, 21, and 23 are identical. For the cause of Anthimos' deposition, see below Nos. 32 and 33. See documents in T. Gritsopoulos, "Δύο συνοδικαὶ καθαιρέσεις Μητροπολιτῶν Κορίνθου κατὰ τὸν 17^{ον} αἰῶνα," *Παλαιο-νησιολογία* VI (1969-70), 391.

11. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1611-22 Mar. 1619 when the see of Drama was joined to that of Philippi under Klemes of Philippi and Neophytos is cited as resigned; Mystakides, *Katalogoi*, p. 170; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 785. Janin records May as Neophytos' initial date, but in *Codex Alpha*, pp. 50-51 Neophytos is listed in Mar. 1611.

Anastasiou (*TEE*, V, 221) does not know of Neophytos, listing Athanasios with no date, followed by Klemes in 1619; while Ateses (I, 148) lists Athanasios in 1593, followed by Neophytos without date, and Klemes from 1607-1624.

12. In the MS: Dec. 1616-Dec. 1625; Nos. 6, 42.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1616-1626, resigned.

Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, IX, 45) lists Metrophanes without any date but does date his predecessor, Achilleios, from 1614-1617. But Achilleios was already the former metropolitan in Dec. 1616; see above No. 2 and *Codex Alpha*, p. 78. Metrophanes was also the former metropolitan when he was unfrocked in 1634; *ibid.*, pp. 277-78; Sathas, 570. Ateses (II, 131) lists Metrophanes from 1618, while Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, p. 200) lists him to 1626.

13. In the MS: Dec. 1616-26 Apr. 1626; Nos. 6, 21, 23, 29, 30, 46.

Inclusive dates: Elected, July 1616-26 Apr. 1626 when his

successor Achilleios was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 46 and **Codex Alpha**, p. 495; Sathas, 560. Stogoglou (TEE, XI, 116) lists Timotheos from 1616-1625 followed by Achilleios, 1625-1628. Pennas (*Historia*, pp. 458-59) does the same.

14. Inclusive dates: unknown. See Germanos, VIII, 173.

15. Perhaps Gregorios attested on 4 Nov. 1620. If this is true, then in the MS: Dec. 1616-4 Nov. 1620.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1616-4 Nov. 1620. Germanos (VIII, 157) attests Gregorios on 4 Nov. 1620. Below in No. 21, Gregorios signs in Slavonic.

16. Inclusive dates: 22 Aug. 1610-1620; initial date in Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Katalogos*, p. 99. See too Eustratiades, *Hellenika*, III, 48; **Codex Alpha**, pp. 486-87; and Germanos, VI, 92, n. 1 and Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 142, where he is also cited in 1621.

17. Probably George who is cited from Jan.-Apr. 1612 in **Codex Alpha**, pp. 57, 58, 59, 60.

Laskarakes who followed George in the office of Grand Logothetes is usually attested from 1630-Aug. 1643. The Grand Logothetes who signs above could be either George or Laskarakes. See Arampatzoglou, "Τὸ δξίωμα τοῦ Μεγάλου Λαγαθέτου ἐν τῷ Οἰκουμένικῳ Πατριαρχείῳ," *Orthodoxia*, XIX (1944), p. 240. See too Patrinelys, *EMA*, XII (1962) p. 150.

18. In the MS: Dec. 1616-June 1617; Nos. 6, 7.

Inclusive dates: May 1608-June 1617. See **Codex Alpha**, p. 54. Gritsopoulos (TEE, VIII, 131) lists Timotheos only in 1616; Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, 192) lists him from 1612, while Sathas (p. 556) cites him on 19 July 1609, Giannopoulos (*EP*, X, 270) records him in 1611 and Ateses (I, 476) from 1609-1616.

19. Either Ioasaph, cited between 1604-1606 or Metrophanes, cited between 1621-1625. See Ateses, I, 430 and Athanasios Komines, "Ἀνέκδοτος Ἐπισκοπικὸς κατάλογος Θηβῶν," *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στεριωαλλανικῶν Μελετῶν*, I (1968), 94, 99.

20. In the MS: Dec. 1616-July 1624; Nos. 6, 8, 21, 22, 24, 32, 33, 37.

Inclusive dates: Elected, May 1605-Aug. 1634, resigned. Ioasaph was Metropolitan of Laodikia when elected to Prousa. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, pp. 79, 98; Sathas, 570. Phoropoulos

(TEE, X, 679) follows Alexoudes (Leukoma, p. 185) in listing Ioasaph from 1604-1634.

21. Inclusive dates: Elected, 14 Mar. 1613-Feb. 1617, abandoned see and later converted to Roman Catholicism when he became Bishop of Crotona. Sphyroeras (TEE, X, 89) begins Nikephoros' tenure in 1612 as does Ateses II, 170. For the extraordinary career and literary activity of Nikephoros, see I. Chasiotes, **Μακάριος, Θεόδωρος καὶ Νικηφόρος οἱ Μαλισσηνοί (Μαλισσουργοί)** (Thessalonike, 1966), pp. 91-170.

22. In the MS: Dec. 1616-Nov. 1617; Nos. 6, 8.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1616-1618; A. Zapheiriadou, "Ἱστορία τῆς Ἰμβρου," (Thrakika, LXV (1971), 284) only lists Makarios in 1618.

23. In the MS: Dec. 1616-July 1624; Nos. 6, 37. The Grand Rhetor is Michael, attested from Jan. 1612-May 1616 in Codex Alpha, pp. 57, 58, 59, 60, 74, and on 15 June 1628 in Mertzios, Patriarchika, p. 57. There is another Michael attested in May 1641 (Codex Alpha, pp. 392-93) who may be the same person. The next Grand Rhetor is Demetrios, attested from Jan. 1645-7-May 1646.

24. In the MS: Dec. 1616-Nov. 1617; Nos. 6, 8.

Inclusive dates: 1613-before Dec. 1626; Dec. 1626-1627. Alexoudes (Leukoma, p. 108) cites Gabriel in 1626; Mystakides (Katalogoi, p. 173) in 1626, deposed; Janin (Dictionnaire, XV, 559) in 1616 and exonerated in Dec. 1626; Anonymous (TEE, V, 1150) attests him in 1626 and 1627. Gabriel's earliest attestation is found in Codex Alpha, p. 67b; his restoration in Dec. 1626 on p. 171. He had been replaced by Ignatios (formerly of Ganos & Chora, 1616-1624) in 1625; he died in Dec. 1626.

25. In the MS: Dec. 1616-July 1624; Nos. 6, 8, 22, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37.

Inclusive dates: 1601-8 June 1633, cited as dead; Codex Alpha, p. 33; Sathas, p. 569; Chamoudopoulos, EA, II, 669; Germanos, ECH, XII, 13; Christopoulos, TEE, IX, 328. Gedeon (Ephe-merides, p. 90) cites a Raphael in 1617. This may be a misreading.

Ateses (I, 125 and II, 152) records Gabriel from "1602-1624, resigned," then Parthenios who was "transferred to Ioannina in 1632," followed by another Gabriel in 1632, 1633. But Codex Alpha, p. 233, which records the election of Parthenios, lists him as an hieromonk not the former metropolitan of Naupaktos &

Arta. Therefore, I agree with Germanos who continues Gabriel's tenure until 8 July 1633 when his successor Laurentios was elected and he is cited as dead. See Germanos, ECH, XII, 67.

26. In the MS: Dec. 1616-Dec. 1625; Nos. 6, 8, 12, 16, 18, 22, 24, 40, 42.

Inclusive dates: Apr. 1611-27 May 1629, resigned; see **Codex Alpha**, p. 57 for initial date; Sathas, p. 567; Ateses, II, 147. Konstantinides (TEE, II, 272) lists Konstantios only in 1629 while Ateses (ibid.) cites Neophytos who interrupted Konstantios' tenure in 1624.

27. In the MS: Dec. 1616-16 June 1620; Nos. 6, 19, 20.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 20 Mar. 1606-16 June 1620, resigned. See below No. 20 and Germanos, VIII, 131.

7 (22, 11b)

PATRIARCHAL LETTER

Synodike apophasis

Patriarch Timotheos II

June [1617, Indiction 15]¹

Priest Ioannes, the Oikonomos of the Diocese of Zetounion, accompanied by the notables of the province of Pteleon, representing the views of clergy and laity alike, appear before the Holy Synod and petition that their eparchy of Zetounion and Pteleon be elevated to the rank of archdiocese. (The same petition had been presented to and was approved by the "imperial authority.") The petition is based on the fact that their eparchy has grown in means and population, and is now capable of supporting "a higher rank." The Holy Synod, in which participated all the hierarchs who were present at the Patriarchate, grants the petition which has the concurrence of Metropolitan Timotheos of Larissa² [from whom the archdiocese is to be detached] and declares the eparchy of Zetounion and Pteleon to be an archdiocese dependent upon no other authority except that of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

This decision was made even though Patriarch Timotheos and the Holy Synod noted that according to Apostolic and patriarchal ordinances, dioceses were not to be detached from their respective metropolies. Nevertheless, circumstances in the past had caused various emperors, through imperial and synodical rulings to do just that. In this way Media, once a diocese of Heraklia, was declared a metropolis; Prousa, a diocese of Nikomedia, became a metropolis, as did Sozopolis and Ainos. Similarly, patriarchs detached various dioceses and promoted them to archdioceses, to wit: Samos and Santorine from Rhodes; Melos from Paronaxia; and Elasson & Phanarion from Larissa.

†Vartholomaïos of Heraklia,³ †Neophytos of Nikomedia,⁴ †Hieremias of Chalkedon,⁵ Gabriel of Philippopolis,⁶ †Averkios of Verroia,⁷ †Ioasaph of Lakdaimonia,⁸ Gerasimos of Amasia,⁹ †Neophytos of Chios,¹⁰ †Paisios of Pisidia,¹¹ Ignatios of Ganos¹²

Menologema

Text: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta*, IV, 88-90. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10. In the *Analekta*, he reads Neophytos instead of Ignatios of Ganos.

1. The document erroneously reads: Indiction 5.

2. See above No. 6.

3. Inclusive dates: unknown. Vartholomaïos of Heraklia does not appear in the known episcopal lists. Arampatzoglou (*Orthodoxia*, XIX (1944), 74) believes Papadopoulos-Kerameus (*Analekta*, IV, 88-90) erred when he read Vartholomaïos of Heraklia in the above document. If there is an error, however, it was made by the hierarch who signed the patriarchal letter because the signature is quite clear. Moreover, it would not be the first time that an hierarch's tenure was interrupted for a short time.

4. In the MS: June 1617-May 1635: Nos. 7, 9, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 32, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 48, 49, 51.

Inclusive dates: June 1617-4 May 1639, resigned; Chamoudopoulos, *EA*, II, 696; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 103. Alexoudes (*Leukoma*, 109) and Konstantinides (*TEE*, X, 543) list Neophytos in 1618, followed by Dionysios in 1621, and Neophytos (the

same?) from 1624-1639. Konstantinides overlooked Gritsopoulos' study, "Ὁ Στασινὸς τῆς Ἀκοῦας καὶ ἡ οἰκογένεια Λαμπαρδοπούλου," *Ἑλληνικά*, XIII (1954), 129-59, where Neophytos' tenure is listed from Aug. 1618-May 1639 when he resigned due to illness; see especially pp. 143-48.

Gritsopoulos' initial date is based on the agreement reached between Neophytos (then of Drama) and Gabriel, Neophytos' predecessor at Nikomedia. Gritsopoulos knows the above document, dated June 1617 with Neophytos' signature but believes there is an error involved here. I believe that Gabriel effectively resigned ca. June 1617 and Neophytos succeeded him and thus signed above. The official resignation document, dated Aug. 1618, is a confirmation of that act which had been executed the previous year.

5. Inclusive dates: Unknown. Hieremias interrupted Timotheos' tenure but for how long is not known. Arampatzoglou (*Orthodoxia*, XIX, 74) believes that Papadopoulos-Kerameus (*Analekta*, IV, 88-90) erred again when he listed Hieremias in June 1617, but he did not. The signature is quite clear in the document.

6. Inclusive dates: Unknown. Sathas, 572 and Germanos, VIII, 185, list a Gabriel who was elected in Dec. 1636. Our hierarch must have interrupted the tenure of Ioasaph, 1608-28 Mar. 1627, cited as dead.

7. In the MS: June 1617-12 Aug. 1618; Nos. 7, 10.

Inclusive dates: 1613-12 Aug. 1618, resigned. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, VIII, 887) and Stamoules (*EMA*, XII, 47) list Averkios in 1613 only, while Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, III, 826) lists him from 1613-1628.

8. In the MS: June 1617-Feb. 1641; Nos. 7, 21, 22, 24, 32, 37, 38, 52, 53, 55, 60, 64, 65.

Inclusive dates: ca. June 1617 and 4 Nov. 1620-5 Aug. 1641.

Ioasaph's predecessor and successor, Dionysios, is listed by Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, VIII, 84) in 1603 and deposed in 1607. Subsequently, according to Gritsopoulos, Dionysios was forgiven and restored (he does not say when) to his see where he died in Dec. 1620. He lists Ioasaph from 1620-1641. Ateses (II, 125) lists Ioasaph from 1617-1640 and Dionysios from 1604-1607, deposed; restored in 1611-1620, died.

It would appear from the above document and No. 21 below that Ioasaph replaced Dionysios at least from about June 1617.

He apparently was expelled but was restored at least by 4 Nov. 1620. Thus the two hierarchs can be attested as follows based on the present MS and **Codex Alpha**: Dionysios, 1603-1607, deposed. Successor unknown. Dionysios, June 1609 (**Codex Alpha**, p. 47) -May 1616 (*ibid.*, p. 77). Ioasaph, June 1617. Dionysios, May 1620 (*ibid.*, pp. 486-87)-before 4 Nov. 1620. Ioasaph, 4 Nov. 1620-5 Aug. 1641 (*ibid.*, pp. 400-01).

9. Inclusive dates: Unknown. There is a Gerasimos whose election is attested in Nov. 1657; Sathas, p. 593.

10. In the MS: June-Nov. 1617; Nos. 7, 8.

Inclusive dates: June-Nov. 1617. Janin (**Dictionnaire**, XII, 745) lists Neophytos “?-1617,” while Nikolopoulos (**TEE**, XI, 134) lists him in 1617 without the question mark.

11. Inclusive dates: Unknown.

12. In the MS: June 1617-May 1622; Nos. 7, 8, 21, 22, 24, 32.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 1616-1 Apr. 1624, resigned; Chamoudopoulos, **EA**, II, 668; Germanos, VI, 59. Patrinely (**TEE**, IV, 231) and Stamoules (**Thrakika**, XIV, 99) also attests Ignatios in 1613. In **Codex Alpha**, p. 178, dated Dec. 1626, Ignatios is cited as having been elected Metropolitan of Ephesos in 1625 and to have died sometime before Dec. 1626.

8 (6-3)

INVALIDATION OF AN ELECTION

Synodikon gramma

Patriarch Timotheos II

November 7126 [1617], Indiction 1

Bishop Hieremias of Polyane¹ petitions Patriarch Timotheos II and the Holy Synod to declare his election to the diocese of Kitros invalid. Hieremias explains that upon assuming his duties in Kitros, pirates raided his diocese [literally: “our mighty empire,” with reference to the Ottoman Empire] and turned it into a wilderness. The Turkish governor (*dikastes*) and the local Turks accused him and his Christian flock of being accomplices. This resulted in the deaths of many Christians, his flight to save his life, and his wandering

destitute from city to city begging for charity. Subsequently, another was ordained in his place.

The Synod accepts Hieremias' petition and by invalidating his election to Kitros makes him eligible for transfer to another see.

†Theophanes of Old Patras, †Porphyrios of Nikaia, †Gregorios of Ankyra,² †Ignatios of Trapezous,³ †Gregorios of Amasia,⁴ † . . . of . . . , †Konstantios of Mitylene, †[Neophytos] of Chios, † . . . of . . . , †Grand Logothetes [George] of the Great Church signs for †Patriarch [Athanasios] of Antioch,⁵ †Patriarch [Theophanes] of Jerusalem, and for the Metropolitans [†Paisios] of Thessalonike, [†Theophanes] of Athens, [†Ioasaph] of Prousa, [†Ignatios] of Ganos & Chora, and [†Makarios] of Imvros, †Grand Sakellarios [Ioannes]⁶ of the Great Church signs for the Metropolitans [†Gabriel] of Ephesos, [†Gabriel] of Tornovo, [†Venediktos] of Neokaisaria,⁷ [†Gabriel] of Naupaktos [&Arta], [†Klimes] of Lemnos
Monokondylion. Menologema.

Text: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta*, IV, 90-92 where the Indiction is 15 and where Gregorios of Amasia and Konstantios of Mitylene are omitted. Arampatzoglou (*Photieios* I, 166) omits only the first introductory lines of the text, erroneously dates the document 1618, and omits Theophanes of Old Patras, Porphyrios of Nikaia, Gregorios of Ankyra, and Ignatios of Trapezous. Partial text: Chrysanthos, *Trapezous*, p. 552; Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 8.

1. In the MS: Nov. 1617-18 Nov. 1618; Nos. 8, 12.

Inclusive dates: Mar. 1606-before Sept. 1615, transferred to Kitros. Initial date in *Codex Alpha*, p. 23 and above No. 2, n. 5. On 18 Nov. 1618, Hieremias was elected Metropolitan of Selyvria; see below No. 12.

2. Inclusive dates: Unknown.

Karalevsky (*Dictionnaire*, II, 1542) and Konidares (*TCE*, I, 227) do not list Gregorios who is listed by Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, I, 282), but without a date. The latter lists a Parthenios from 1602-1631.

3. In the MS: Nov. 1617-18 Nov. 1618; Nos. 8, 12.

Inclusive dates: 6 Apr. 1610-1620. Initial date in **Codex Alpha**, p. 40; Chrysanthos, Trapezous, p. 790. According to Sathas (p. 560), however, Ignatios was deposed in May 1616. He was probably reinstated soon afterwards.

4. In the MS: Nov. 1617-May 1625; Nos. 8, 14, 36, 41.

Inclusive dates: June 1617-12 Apr. 1623, illegally seized the Patriarchate of Constantinople, where he remained until 18 June 1623 when he was expelled.

Gritsopoulos (**TEE**, II, 969) lists Gregorios from 1617-1636, Vailhé (**Dictionnaire**, II, 969) lists him to ca. 30 Apr. 1630, while Patrinelys, **EMA**, XII, 138, attests Gregorios from 1618.

With the assistance of the deposed Metropolitan Metrophanes of Achrida and Ioasaph of Serres, Gregorios, a friend and tool of the Jesuits, succeeded in expelling Patriarch Kyrillos I and without being legally elected, seized the patriarchal throne. It took Gregorios, referred to in patriarchal documents as **Stravo-Amaseias** (the blind one from Amasia), almost a month to be formally installed as patriarch. This took place on 17 May 1623. But on 18 June 1623, Gregorios was expelled and exiled to Rhodes. A week later, he was formally deposed and excommunicated. He was succeeded by Patriarch Anthimos.

Gregorios' brief tenure as patriarch was devoid of any positive features. He did contribute to the rivalry and tensions between the pro and anti-Roman factions and added to the enormous debt of the Patriarchate. Germanos, **Orthodoxia**, IX (1934), pp. 489-91.

5. Patriarch Athanasios II Dabbas, ca. Aug. 1612-1620; Karalevsky, **Dictionnaire**, III, 700.

6. Probably Ioannes cited in Jan. 1605; E. Hurmuzaki, **Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor**, ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vol. XIII (Bucharest, 1909), p. 385.

7. Inclusive dates: May 1616-20 Jan. 1623, resigned; **Codex Alpha**, pp. 79, 134, Alexoudes (**Leukoma**, p. 169) attests Venediktos only in 1623.

9 (19, 10)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

6 May 7126 [1618], Indiction 1

Hieromonk Longinos, from the island of Patmos, is elected Metropolitan of Synada¹ where there has been a vacancy "for many years."

Other candidates: Protosynkelos Ioasaph and Protosynkelos of Thessalonike Gregorios

†Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Paisios of Thessalonike, †Xenophon of Smyrna,² †Makarios of Ganos /& Chora/, †Gregorios of Vodena³

Menologema

In the text, the menologema reads: January, Indiction 2 and there are some practice signatures of Apostolos of Amasia repeated six times in the lower half of the page. The name Apostolos, however, does not appear in the lists of metropolitans of Amasia.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10. He omits Xenophon of Smyrna, Gregorios of Vodena, and substitutes Porphyrios for Paisios of Thessalonike. Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 90, dates the document 16 May 1616.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected 6 May 1618-Mar. 1621; see *Codex Alpha*, pp. 98-99 for the terminal attestation.

2. In the MS: 6 May 1618-June 1619; Nos. 9, 14.

Inclusive dates: 6 May 1618-June 1619.

Xenophon is not cited by Gritsopoulos and Charete (*TEE*, XI, 252) nor by Solomonides, *Ἡ Ἱστορία τῆς Σμύρνης* (Athens, 1960).

3. In the MS: 6 May 1618-May 1620; Nos. 9, 12, 16.

Inclusive dates: 1 June 1616-before May 1620. 1 May 1620, as the former Bishop of Vodena, he was elected Metropolitan of Larissa where he served until 1645. See below No. 16. Gregorios is unknown to Ateses, I, 158.

10 (15, 8)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

12 August 7126 [1618], Indiction 1

Hieromonk Kyrillos is elected Metropolitan of Verroia¹ to succeed Averkios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Grand Archimandrites Anthimos and Hieromonk Pachomios

†Gabriel of . . . , †Theophanes of Old Patras,
†Anthimos formerly of . . . , †Metrophanes of Drystra,³
†Ioakeim, formerly of Drystra⁴

Menologema in text: January, Indiction 5 and some practice signatures in the lower part of the page.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 9. He omits Gabriel of . . . and Ananias, formerly of

1. In the MS: 12 Aug. 1618-4 Nov. 1620. Nos. 10, 11, 21.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 12 Aug. 1618-4 Oct. 1633, elected Patriarch of Constantinople as Kyrillos II.

In the MS (as Patriarch): May 1635-[June] 1639; Nos. 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 4 Oct. 1633-11 Oct. 1633, deposed.

Kyrillos II Kontares was the great antagonist of Patriarch Kyrillos I Loukaris. Supported by the French and Dutch embassies, Kyrillos II was able to expell and succeed Kyrillos I on 4 Oct. 1633. But he remained patriarch for only eight days because he was in turn expelled by Kyrillos Loukaris who returned for the third time.

Kyrillos II became patriarch for a second and third time: beginning Mar. 1635-middle of June 1636, when he ousted Kyrillos I, and on 20 June 1638-end of June 1639 when he repeated the same act. Soon after his third expulsion, Kyrillos II was exiled to North Africa where he was murdered by the Ottoman authorities.

This rivalry between the two patriarchs, a disaster for the Greek people and the Orthodox Church, was based on personal and theological grounds. Kyrillos I was an anti-papist and found support for his policies among the Protestant powers represented at the Ottoman court, while Kyrillos II was a pro-papist and was supported by Roman Catholic powers.

Petit (*Echos d' Orient*, V, 155) relates an incident, recorded by Allatius, which may be an explanation for Kyrillos Kontares' personal hatred for Loukaris. As Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris appointed Kontares administrator of Thessalonike when its metropolitan Paisios was absent in Russia. When Loukaris refused to make the appointment permanent, Kontares became an enemy instead of a friend.

Despite the above election document, Kyrillos' tenure as Metropolitan of Verroia is quite confused among the authorities. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, VIII, 887) lists Kyrillos in 1597 and Kyrillos from 1630-1633. Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, III, 826) lists him in 1597 and from 1632-1634, while S. Stamoules, *EMA*, XII, 46, lists him on 28 Feb. 1621. Ateses (I, 32) dates him from 1618-1621 and from 1633-1635.

2. See above No. 7.

3. Inclusive dates: Elected, Aug. 1618-before 21 Dec. 1621. Metrophanes was Metropolitan of Kapha & Phoula (June 1616-Aug. 1618) when elected to Drystra; Sathas, p. 560, *Codex Alpha*, p. 83, and below No. 26. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XI, 158 and XIV, 826) lists Metrophanes only in 1622, while Germanos (VIII, 137) only cites his election.

4. Inclusive dates: 1615-before Aug. 1618 and Jan. 1626-April 1628, deposed; forgiven ca. Apr. 1628-before 22 Mar. 1633, cited as having been deposed and now the deposition is reconfirmed. For the initial dates, see Tudor Mateescu, "Les dioceses Orthodoxes de la Dobrudja sous la domination Ottomane," *Balkan Studies*, XIII (1972), p. 281; *Codex Alpha*, pp. 169, 182, 245, 245b; Germanos, VIII, 138; and Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 826.

11 (17, 9)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

August 7126 [1618], Indiction 1

Hieromonk and pneumatikos Gennadios is elected Metropolitan of Kapha & Phoula¹ to succeed Metrophanes who was promoted to the metropolis of Drystra.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Nektarios and Hieromonk Meletios

†Gabriel of . . . , †Theophanes of Old Patras, †Metrophanes of Drystra, †Anthimos, formerly of . . . , †Kyrillos of Verroia, †Laurentios, formerly of Vizya, †Hieremias of Kitros

Menologema

Menologema in the text: January, Indiction 2.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 9. He omits Gabriel of . . . , Ananias, formerly of . . . , and Laurentios, formerly of Vizya.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, Aug. 1618-2 Aug. 1631 when his successor Parthenios was elected and he is cited as dead; *Codex Alpha*, p. 228. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XI, 158) does not know Gennadios' election date.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 1 June 1616-Aug. 1618, elected Metropolitan of Drystra. See above No. 10, n 3, Sathas, p. 560. See too Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XI, 158 where Metrophanes is listed "June 1616-?."

12 (5, 3)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

18 November 7127 [1618], Indiction 2

Bishop Hieremias formerly of Polyane¹ is elected Metropolitan of Selyvria² to succeed Theophanes who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Pachomios of Galata and Hieromonk Laurentios "who sings at the church of St. Paraskeve."

†Timotheos of Heraklia,⁴ †Konstantios of Mitylene, †Klimes of Proikonesos,⁵ Ignatios of Trapezous, Gregorios of Vodena, Xenophon of Smyrna, †Symeon, formerly of Christianoupolis,⁶ †Gregorios of Philadelphia⁷

Menologema

Text: Arampatzoglou, Photieios I, 129, n. He erroneously dates this 10 November and substitutes Gregorios for Konstantios of Mitylene.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke, IV, 8. He substitutes Iakovos for Hieremias of Polyane, Paulos for Pachomios of Galata, and includes only three signatories: Klimes of Proikonesos, Ignatios of Trapezous, and Gregorios of Philadelphia.

Cited: Germanos, VI, 119 with correct date; Gritsopoulos, Archeion, XXI (1956), 115.

1. See above No. 8.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 18 Nov. 1618-1620; Vaporis, *Codex Alpha*, No. 85; Germanos, VI, 119; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, XI, 121. Hieremias had served as Bishop of Polyane and of Kitros; see above Nos. 2 and 8 and Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 168.

3. Inclusive dates: May 1608-18 Nov. 1618, cited as dead. *Codex Alpha*, p. 26; Germanos, VI, 118-19; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*,

XI, 121; idem, *Archeion*, XXI, 114-15; Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 168.

4. In the MS: 18 Nov. 1618-2 Feb. 1622; Nos. 12, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30.

Inclusive dates: Feb. 1616-2 Feb. 1622, cited as dead, Germanos, VI, 75; Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 117. Konstantinides (TEE, VI, 61) lists Timotheos from 1616-1620. He is not listed by Alexoudes, *Leukoma*, p. 109.

5. In the MS: 18 Nov. 1618-26 Apr. 1626; Nos. 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46.

Inclusive dates: Aug. 1605-July 1626. Initial date in *Codex Alpha*, p. 205 last attestation, *ibid.*, p. 173.

Klimes successor, Daniel, is attested in 1629, but it cannot be determined when Klimes' tenure ended and Daniel's began. M. Gedeon, *Προικόνησος ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παρόικία, ναοὶ καὶ μοναὶ μητροπολίται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι* (Constantinople, 1895), p. 206. Gritsopoulos (TEE, X, 613) lists Klimes in 1585 and 1624, while Patrinelys (EMA, XII, 139) attests him from 1585-1639. I suspect that Klimes, cited in 1585 is not the Klimes attested from 1605-1626. Gritsopoulos has a Pankratios and a Dionysios between the two dates, while Gedeon lists a Dionysios in the same period.

6. Inclusive dates: May 1593-28 May 1602, cited as deposed; returned, July 1605-before June 1614, when he is cited as former; Sathas, p. 551; C. Knetes, "Ἡ Μητρόπολις Χριστιανουπόλεως," EA, XXX (1910), 69-70; *Codex Alpha*, pp. 23, 70; Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 773) dates Symeon's return in 1610.

7. Inclusive dates: unknown. Both P. Nikolopoulos (TEE, XI, 1036) and M. Manousakas, "Ἡ ἐν Βενετία Ἑλληνικὴ κοινότης καὶ οἱ μητροπολίται Φιλαδελφίας," EEBS, XXXVII (1969-70), p. 182, list Gabriel from 18 July 1577- 21 Oct. 1616, and Theophanes from 14 Mar. 1617-29 Feb. 1632. They are unaware of Gregorios. Yet Gregorios appears in the above document, reprinted by Arampatzoglou in Photieios, I, 129 and in Papadopoulos-Kerameus' resume.

13 (21, 11)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Timotheos II

26 June 7127 [1619], Indiction 2

Archbishop Neophytos of Zetounion & Pteleon resigns from his office due to old age and debts. He "gives permission" to Patriarch [Timotheos] to ordain another in his place.

†Archbishop Neophytos, formerly of Zetounion & Pteleon¹

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10. He refers to Neophytos as bishop instead of archbishop.

1. See below No. 14.

14 (20, 10b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

June 7127 [1619], Indiction 2

Bishop Ioasaph of Thaumako¹ is elected Archbishop of Zetounion & Pteleon² to succeed Neophytos who resigned.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Pachomios the Protosynkelos and Hieromonk Anthimos the Protosynkelos

†Gregorios of Amasia, †Xenophon of Smyrna,
†Hieremias of Selyvria, †Klemes of Proikonesos
Menologema

Menologema in text: August, Indiction 2.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10 where Gregorios of Amasia and Xenophon of Smyrna are omitted.

1. Inclusive dates: 1612-June 1619, elected Archbishop of Zetounion & Pteleon; *Codex Alpha*, p. 60; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 90. Ioasaph is unknown to Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, 174), to Giannopoulos (*EP*, XIV, 294), and *idem.*, *Theologia*, XIII (1935), 294.

2. In the MS: June 1619-June 1622; Nos. 14, 34.

Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1619-ca. June 1622, deposed; restored, June 1622-?

Ioasaph is unknown to the authorities consulted.

3. In the MS: June 1619; Nos. 13, 14.

Inclusive dates: ?-26 June 1619, resigned. Neophytos is also unknown.

15 (8, 4)

RESIGNATION

Paraitsis

Patriarch Timotheos II

23 February 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

Archbishop Symeon of Pogoniane resigns from his see due to his inability to administer his archdiocese because of illness. He gives permission to Patriarch Timotheos to ordain another in his place.

†Archbishop Symeon, formerly of Pogoniane¹

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 8.

1. Inclusive dates: ?-23 Feb. 1620, resigned. Germanos, *ECH*, XII, 93; Ateses, I, 155.

16 (9, 5)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

May 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

Gregorios, formerly Bishop of Vodena¹ is elected Metropolitan of Larissa² to succeed Athanasios who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Isaia and Hieromonk Ioasaph

†Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Anthimos of Korinth, †Dionysios of Lakedaimonia,⁴ †Konstantios of Mitylene, †Nektarios of Christianoupolis,⁵ †Klemes of Proikonesos, †Makarios, formerly of Ganos & Chora
Menologema

In addition to the scribbling at the bottom there are two signatures that appear not to belong to the document: Gregorios of Proikonesos and Hierotheos of Letitza.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 8-9. He omits Athanasios of Larissa and reads Athanasios instead of Anthimos of Korinth.

1. See above No. 9.

2. In the MS: May 1620-Oct. 1643; Nos. 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 32, 33; 34, 37, 48, 49, 51, 59, 60, 61, 66, 67.

Inclusive dates: Elected, May 1620-12 Apr. 1645, cited as dead; Sathas, p. 578.

Gritsopoulos (TEE, VIII, 130-31) lists Gregorios from "before 1623-1645," while Giannopoulos (EP, 271) lists him from 1621-1645.

3. Inclusive dates: after 1617?-May 1620, cited as dead.

Timotheos, Athanasios' predecessor, is attested as late as June 1617 (see above No. 6) while he is cited as dead in May 1620. He is unknown to Gritsopoulos (TEE, VIII, 130-31) and to Giannopoulos (EP, 271).

4. In the MS: May-June 1620; Nos. 16, 18.

Inclusive dates: 18 Jan. 1603-1607, deposed; restored before June 1609-before May 1616; May 1620-before Nov. 1620, cited as dead. Sathas, 551-52, 555. See Gritsopoulos, TEE, VIII, 84 and above No. 7, n 8. Ateses (II, 125) lists Dionysios from 1604-1607, 1611-1620.

5. In the MS: May-June 1620; Nos. 16, 20.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 1586-before May 1593, deposed; restored, 1614-June 1620. Janin, Dictionnaire, XII (1953), 774; Knetes, EA, XXX (1910), 70; D. Doukakes, "Κατάλογος μητροπολιτῶν Χριστιανουπόλεως," EPH, IV (1909), 367; and especially, Patrinoles, EMA, XII, 123.

17 (10, 5)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Timotheos II

May 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

Metropolitan Timotheos of Chalkedon resigns due to illness, great indebtedness, and "the disturbances of the time." He gives permission to Patriarch Timotheos to elect a successor.

†Metropolitan Timotheos, formerly of Chalkedon¹
Menologema

Menologema in the text: July, Indiction 3.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke, IV, 9.

1. See above No. 12.

18 (11, 6)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

June 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

Hieromonk Ioseph is elected Metropolitan of Chalkedon¹ to succeed Timotheos who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Averkios and Hieromonk Laurentios the Protosynkelos of Korinth

†Neophytos of Nikomedia, †[Dionysios] of Lakdaimonia, †Gregorios of Larissa, †Makarios, formerly of Ganos [& Chora], †Konstantios of Mitylene, †Klemes of Proikonesos

Menologema

Another **Menologema** in the text: April, Indiction 13.

Text: Arampatzoglou, *Orthodoxia*, XIX, 73, n 34. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 9.

1. In the MS: June-4 Nov. 1620; Nos. 18, 21.

Inclusive dates: June 1620-1622. Arampatzoglou (*Orthodoxia*, XIX, 74) dated Ioseph's election in Apr. 1620 despite the clear date in the text and the equally clear date in Timotheos' resignation (May 1620). He was probably misled by the **menologema** at the bottom of the page which reads, April, Indiction 3. Below this, however, there is some scribbling which may indicate that the **menologema** was written for practice.

All authorities after Arampatzoglou were misled by him; they should have followed Papadopoulos-Kerameus. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 275) dates Ioseph in Apr. 1620; Stavrides (*TEE*, XII, 54) from Apr. 1620-1622; while Alexoudes (*Leukoma*, 110) dates him in 1620 and notes his deposition.

2. See above No. 6.

19 (12, 6)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Timotheos II

16 June 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

Metropolitan Sophronios of Vidyna resigns because he is "unable to administer and shepherd" his province. He gives permission to Patriarch Timotheos to ordain another in his place.

†Metropolitan Sophronios, formerly of Vidyna¹

Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 9.

1. See above No. 6.

20 (13, 7)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

June 7128 [1620], Indiction 3

"Protosynkelos of the Great Church of Christ" Euthymios is elected Metropolitan of Vidyna¹ to succeed Sophronios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Averkios and Hieromonk Avvakoum

†Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Nektarios of Christianoupolis, †Klemes of Proikonesos, †Makarios, formerly of Ganos & Chora

Menologema

Menologema in the text: August, Indiction 4.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 9. He does not record Makarios as former.

Cited: Athenagoras, *EEBS*, IX (1932), 252. He erroneously has Euthymios elected Metropolitan of Varna instead of Vidyna.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1620-? See Germanos, VIII, 132.

2. See above No. 6.

21 (23, 12)

PATRIARCHAL ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Timotheos II

4 November 7129 [1620], Indiction 4

The Most-wise Patriarch Kyrillos of Alexandria¹ is elected Patriarch of Constantinople² to succeed Patriarch Timotheos who died.³

Other candidates: Metropolitan Nikephoros of Laodikia⁴ and Bishop Melchesedek of Raidesto and Panion⁵

Because there had been fear that the patriarchal throne would be seized illegally without the approval of the Holy Synod, hierarchs, officials, and all the people invited Patriarch Kyrillos to come to Constantinople and be elected.

†Timotheos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Kyzikos,⁶ †Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Ioseph of Chalkedon, †Anthimos of Adrianople,⁷ †Ioasaph of Prousa, †Anthimos of Korinth, †Theophanes of Old Patras, †Gregorios of Larissa, †Ioasaph of Philippoupolis,⁸ †Timotheos of Serres, †Klemes of Philippi & Drama,⁹ †Parthenios of Anchialos,¹⁰ †Ioasaph of Lakedaimonia, †Kyrillos of Verroia, †Daniel of Ainos,¹¹ †Arsenios of Media,¹² †Klemes of Proikonesos, †Anthimos of Didymoteichon,¹³ †Ignatios of Ganos & Chora, †Daniel of Neurokopion,¹⁴ †Anthimos of Vizya,¹⁵ †Neophytos of Metra & Athyra, †Kallinikos of Tzeverno,¹⁶ †Ignatios of Chios,¹⁷ †Gregorios of Preslava, †Metrophanes Archbishop of Agathoupolis¹⁸

Text: Legrand, *Bibliographie*, IV, 340-42. He omits Gregorios of Larissa, Ioasaph of Philippoupolis, Timotheos of Serres and reads Daniel of "Nikopolis?" instead of Daniel of Neurokopion, and Chariton of "Chios" instead of Ignatios of Chios. Delikanes, II, 3-4; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 437-38; Demetrakopoulos, *Prosthekai*, pp. 39-40. Demetrakopoulos adds Athanasios of

Kypros and Angelos of Vella; he substitutes Dionysios for Neophytos of Nikomedia, Ioannikios for Ioseph of Chalkedon, Parthenios for Anthimos of Adrianople, Theophylaktos for Theophanes of Old Patras, Kaisarios for Ioasaph of Philippoupolis, Timotheos of Verroia for Timotheos of Serres, Arsenios of Melos for Arsenios of Media, Parthenios for Anthimos of Didymoteichon, Daniel for Anthimos of Vizya, Gregorios of Proilavo for Gregorios of Preslava, and Parthenios for Metrophanes of Agathoupolis; he omits Ioasaph of Prousa, Anthimos of Korinth, Ignatios of Ganos & Chora, Daniel of Neurokopion, and Ignatios of Chios.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10.

1. Inclusive dates: Sept. 1601-4 Nov. 1620, elected Patriarch of Constantinople; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 437-38.

2. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-Apr. 1634; Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 4 Nov. 1620-12 Apr. 1623; 22 Sept. 1623-4 Oct. 1633; 11 Oct. 1633-25 Feb. 1634; beginning Apr. 1634-1/10 Mar. 1635; ca. 5 Mar. 1637-20 June 1638; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, X (1935), 359-60. Kyrillos also served as Administrator of the Patriarchate of Constantinople for about a month beginning on 12 Nov. 1612; see Mertzios, *Patriarchika*, XV, 29.

Undoubtedly, Patriarch Kyrillos I Loukaris is one of the most controversial patriarchs who ever served the Church of Constantinople. One reason this is so is that Patriarch Kyrillos found himself in the midst of a Roman Catholic-Protestant confrontation in the lands of the ancient patriarchates. This confrontation took the form of a twofold struggle: a contest primarily between Rome and Geneva over the religious sympathy and affiliation of the Orthodox and a private struggle between him and Rome for religious supremacy in the Eastern Mediterranean. Needless to say, the religious contest was accompanied by economic and political rivalry as well. In this struggle, each side used the Ottoman government as well as Orthodox sympathizers as instruments for the fulfillment of their ambitions and goals.

This was the first time in its history that the Orthodox Church was confronted simultaneously by an aggressive and militant Roman Catholic Church led by the Society of Jesus (fresh from their recent triumph over the Orthodox at the Council of Brest) and by an equally militant and aspiring Protestant challenge. (See

my "Patriarch Kyrillos I Loukaris and the Translation of the Scriptures into Modern Greek," in the forthcoming issue of *Ἑκκλησιαστικὸς Θόρος*.

From 1612 when he served as Administrator of the Patriarchate to 20 June 1638 when he was expelled for the last time and soon afterwards murdered, Patriarch Kyrillos I was ousted six times. In each instance personal rivalry was stimulated by the politics of the Roman Catholic-Protestant rivalry. Timotheos II, who ousted Kyrillos I in Nov. 1612 was sympathetic to Rome, as was Gregorios IV, known as Stravo-Amaseias (the Blind Metropolitan of Amasia; see above No. 8), who is described as a tool of the Jesuits. Gregorios succeeded in expelling Kyrillos on 12 Apr. 1623. Kyrillos II Kontares, who submitted a confession of faith to the Papacy, succeeded with the aid of French gold, in expelling him three times: once in Oct. 1633 for seven days, in Mar. 1635 for sixteen months, and finally on 20 June 1638 which led to Kyrillos I's death and his own during the following year. Also sympathetic to Rome was Athanasios III, Metropolitan of Thessalonike, who forced Kyrillos out of office on 25 Feb. 1634 for about forty days.

The career of Patriarch Kyrillos is further complicated by the appearance in 1629 of a confession of faith bearing his name and signature. This *Confessio*, an almost completely Calvinistic document by an Orthodox patriarch, is made more intriguing by the fact that Kyrillos never officially acknowledged it as his own in addressing his Orthodox fellow hierarchs or faithful; he never defended it, nor did he ever officially repudiate it; see Ioannes Karmires, *Ὁρθόδοξία καὶ Προτεσταντισμός* (Athens, 1937), p. 209.

3. See above No. 1, n 1.

4. Inclusive dates: 4 Nov. 1620-1630, cited as dead; Sathas, 568.

Laodikia was a titular see in the seventeenth century; see Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 105 and Janin, *TEE*, VII, 121.

5. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-18 Apr. 1626; Nos. 21, 26, 30, 35, 41, 43, 44.

Inclusive dates: 4 Nov. 1620-May 1628; Germanos, VI, 113. Gritsopoulos, *Archeion*, XVIII, 186, extends Melchisedek's tenure to "perhaps 1628," while Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 163, lists him from 1615-1639 with an interruption by Methodios in 1622.

6. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1624; Nos. 21, 22, 24, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36. 37.

Inclusive dates: 4 Nov. 1620-14 Nov. 1633 when his successor Anthimos was elected and he is cited as dead. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XIII, 1195) records "before 19 Nov. 1633;" See H. Makres, "Ἱστορία τῆς Κυζίκου," MCH, VI, 283-301; Sathas (570) has no date.

7. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-1 Dec. 1620; Nos. 21, 22, 24.

Inclusive dates: 9 June 1600-18 June 1623, elected Patriarch of Constantinople.

Anthimos remained patriarch until 22 Sept. of the same year when he voluntarily resigned in favor of Kyrillos I Loukaris whom he considered the legitimate patriarch. After his resignation, Anthimos took up residence in the Monastery of Hagia Lavra on Mount Athos. He died sometime in 1628. Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX, 491-92; Germanos, VI, 40-41 and note 2.

8. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1624; Nos. 21, 23, 24, 37, 40.

Inclusive dates: May 1608-before June 1617; after June 1617-28 Mar. 1627 when his successor Meletios, formerly of Drystra, was elected and he is cited as dead; Sathas, 565; *Codex Alpha*, pp. 26, 181; Germanos, VIII, 184.

9. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-Jan. 1625; Nos. 21, 22, 40.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 29 Jan. 1607-Jan. 1625, cited as dead.

Klimes was elected Metropolitan of Philippi on 29 Jan. 1607 (Sathas, p. 554) and served until 1619 when the Metropolis of Drama was joined to his see. From 1619-ca. Jan. 1625 he served the joint see of Philippi & Drama. Papaevangelos (TEE, XI, 1109) lists Klimes from 1607-1616, while Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XIV, 785) attests his election to (Drama) in 1619, and again in Mar. 1622.

10. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-1 Dec. 1620; Nos. 21, 22, 24.

Inclusive dates: 1609-19 June 1623, elected Metropolitan of Adrianople and later (1639) Patriarch of Constantinople; see below No. 36; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 93; Gritsopoulos, TEE, I, 337; Germanos, VIII, 121; Vailhé, *Dictionnaire*, II, 1512; Sathas, p. 563; and Stamoules, *Thrakika*, XIV, 69.

11. Inclusive dates: 4 Nov. 1620-19 Dec. 1626. See *Codex Alpha*, p. 174. Kyrillos is unknown to Ateses, I, 158.

12. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1624; Nos. 21, 22, 24, 37.

Inclusive dates: 1611-1621, resigned. Tzogas, I, 1081; see, too, Germanos, VI, 46 and Pétridès, *Dictionnaire*, Stamoules (*Thrakika*, XIV, 81) lists Athanasios in 1615.

13. In the MS: 4 Nov.-20 Nov. 1620, Nos. 21, 22.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 24 Dec. 1602-June 1623, resigned; Germanos, VI, 99; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 73; *idem.*, EA, III, 418; Sathas (551) dates Arsenios' election 14 Dec. 1602; Stamoules (*Thrakika*, XIV, 81) lists Athanasios as interrupting Daniel's tenure in 1615.

14. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1624; Nos. 21, 22, 36.

Inclusive dates: Oct. 1620-before 16 July 1631, cited as resigned; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XVI, 428; Sathas, 568; Germanos, VI, 71. Anastasiou (TEE, IV, 1209) cites Anthimos only in 1620.

15. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1611-1622, resigned. See *Codex Alpha*, pp. 50-51; Gritsopoulos (TEE, IX, 436) cites Daniel only in 1622, as does Ateses, I, 170.

16. Inclusive dates: Elected, 1 June 1616 (was Bishop of Tyroulou & Serention)-before 8 Mar. 1631 when his successor Damaskenos was elected and he is cited as dead. Sathas, 560, 568; Gedeon, EA, III, 418; Germanos, VI, 54; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, IX, 46; Gritsopoulos, TEE, II, 890. See also, *Codex Alpha*, pp. 87, 222. Stamoules (*Thrakika*, XIV, 92) following Alexoudes, (*Leukoma*), lists a Daniel in 1621, followed by Kallinikos in 1623, and Anthimos in 1631.

17. Inclusive dates: unknown; see Germanos, VIII, 173.

18. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-1 July 1639; Nos. 21, 22, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 59.

Inclusive dates: after Nov. 1617-4 Oct. 1634, resigned. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 795) records Ignatios from 1617-4 Oct. 1634, while P. Nikolopoulos (TEE, XII, 134) lists him from 1617-1634. The initial date is based on the last attestation of his predecessor, Neophytos; see above No. 7.

19. In the MS: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1624; Nos. 21, 22, 36.

Inclusive dates: 4 Nov. 1620-July 1628, elected Metropolitan of Anchialos; Germanos (VIII, 122) dates the election in June 1628; Gritsopoulos, TEE, I, 106; Vailhé, *Dictionnaire*, II, 1513; Mystakides, *Katalogoi*, 151. See below No. 56.

22 (25, 13)

PATRIARCHAL ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch [Kyrillos I]

30 November 7120 [1620], Indiction 4

Hieromonk Gerasimos the Archimandrites is elected Patriarch of Alexandria¹ to succeed Patriarch Kyrillos who was transferred to the Most-high throne of Constantinople.

Other candidates: Hieromonk and pneumatikos Neophytos the Protosynkelos and Hieromonk and pneumatikos Daniel the Protosynkelos.

†Timotheos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Kyzikos, †Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Porphyrrios of Nikaia, †Paisios of Thessalonike, †Anthimos of Adrianople, †Ioasaph of Prousa, †Anthimos of Korinth, †Theophanes of Old Patras, †Gregorios of Larissa, †Gabriel of Naupaktos & Arta, †Ioasaph of Philippoupolis, †Timotheos of Serres, †Parthenios of Anchialos, †Ioasaph of Lakedaimonia, †Ignatios of Chios, †Klemes of Philippi & Drama, †Konstantios of Mitylene, †Anthimos of Didymoteichon, †Daniel of Ainos, †Arsenios of Media, †Ignatios of Ganos & Chora, †Klemes of Proikonesos, †humble Archbishop Metrophanes of Agathoupolis

Text: Legrand, *Bibliographie*, IV, 342-43; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta*, IV, 92-93; He omits the name of Gabriel of Naupaktos & Arta and reads Bishop Metrophanes instead of Archbishop Metrophanes. Demetrakopoulos, *Prostheke*, pp. 63-64. He substitutes Dionysios for Neophytos of Nikomedia, Parthenios for Porphyrrios of Nikaia, Parthenios for Paisios of Thessalonike, Parthenios for Anthimos of Adrianople, Kaisarios for Ioasaph of Philippoupolis, Parthenios for Anthimos of Didymoteichon, Timotheos of Verroia for Timotheos of Serres, Matthaïos for Ignatios of Chios, Parthenios for Konstantios of Mitylene; he omits Gabriel of Naupaktos & Arta, Anthimos of Korinth, and records Athanasios of Kypros as a possibility. Legrand omits Porphyrrios of

Nikaia, Gregorios of Naupaktos & Arta, and records Athanasios instead of Paisios of Thessalonike. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10, with no signatures. Delikanes (II, 5-6) reads Parthenios instead of Paisios of Thessalonike and adds Ioasaph of Varna who does not appear in the document.

1. In the MS: Nov. 1620-1 Dec. 1620; Nos. 22, 23, 24.

Inclusive dates: Elected, 30 Nov. 1620-30 July 1631, died. See Vaporis, *Codex Gamma*, No. 61 for a brief biography of Gerasimos.

23 (26, 13)

PATRIARCHAL CONFESSION OF FAITH

Homologia pisteos

Patriarch Kyrillos I

[November 7129 [[1620]], Indiction 4

The Confession of faith of Gerasimos, Patriarch elect of the Patriarchal Throne of Alexandria.

†Gerasimos, by the grace of God, candidate for the most holy and Apostolic Throne of the Great City of Alexandria.¹

†Confirmed by Patriarch [Kyrillos] of Constantinople

Text: Delikanes, II, 6-7. Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 10.

1. See above No. 22.

24 (28-29, 15)

PATRIARCHAL INDEBTEDNESS

Synodikon semeioma

Patriarch Kyrillos I

1 December 7129 [1620], Indiction 4

Patriarch Kyrillos I and the Holy Synod express concern over the indebtedness of the Great Church. Patriarch Timotheos II had left behind a debt of fifteen loads,¹ Patriarch Kyrillos I borrowed twenty-five loads for his *peskesion*² and other needs. Of the forty loads owed, five have been repaid. The remaining thirty-five are apportioned (*apokope*) among the hierarchs of the Patriarchate who have until the feast day of St. George³ to pay their share. The Patriarch is given permission by the Synod to depose as disobedient and uncooperative those who do not pay and to replace them.

†Patriarch Gerasimos of Alexandria

†Timotheos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Kyzikos, †Neophytos of Nikomedia, †Porphyrios of Nikaia, †Anthimos of Adrianople, †Paisios of Thessalonike, †Theophanes of Old Patras, †Gregorios of Larissa, †Ioasaph of Philippoupolis, †Ioasaph of Prousa, †Daniel of Ainos, †Parthenios of Anchialos, †Ignatios of Ganos & Chora, †Neophytos of Ioannina,⁴ Klemes of Proikonesos, †Konstantios of Mitylene, †Ioasaph of Lake-daimonia

Menologema

Text: Legrand, *Bibliographie*, IV, 343-45; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta*, IV, 93-95. Resume: *idem.*, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 11.

1. A load was equivalent to 100,000 aspers.

2. Inaugurated in 1467, the *peskesion* was a tax paid to the Ottoman government at the election of each new patriarch. Later it was also paid at the elevation of each new sultan by the patriarch in office.

3. Observed on 23 April.

4. Inclusive date: 1597-before Sept. 1609 and Jan. 1612-Mar. 1621. See *Codex Alpha*, pp. 21, 33, 39, 53, 59, 77. 98-99.

Alexoudes (Leukoma, 184), Germanos (ECH, XII, 67) Anastasiou (TEE, VIII, 68) and Ateses (I, 441) all disagree with each other as to Neophytos' tenure. Alexoudes lists Manases in 1613, Matthaïos in 1614, and Neophytos in 1616. Germanos lists Neophytos from 1597-1605, attests Manases in Mar. 1620, and Neophytos from 1612-1621, while Anastasiou lists Neophytos from 1597-1612, Manases from 1605-1613, Matthaïos in 1614, and Neophytos again from 1616-1620. Ateses list is as follows: Neophytos 1597-1612; Manases 1612, 1613, Neophytos (again) 1616-1620, Matthaïos 1614-1616.

The picture, although confused, is perhaps more like this: Neophytos 1597-before Sept. 1609, Manases attested from Sept. 1609-Apr. 1610, Neophytos again from at least Jan. 1612-Mar. 1621.

25 (32, 16)

RESIGNATION

Paraïtesis

Patriarch Kyrillos I

24 February 7129 [1621], Indiction 4

Metropolitan Gabriel of Methymna resigns from his see due to "continuous scandals . . . dangers and temptations" caused by the "oppressors." He gives permission to Patriarch Kyrillos I to elect a successor.

†Metropolitan Gabriel, formerly of Methymna¹

On the bottom of the page there is the beginning of the election certificate to replace Dionysios of Chios² who resigned. This is probably due to some scribe practicing or having changed his mind on the location of the document, for only three lines were completed.

Resume: Papadouloulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke, IV, 11.

1. Inclusive dates: after June 1614 (?) - 24 Feb. 1621, resigned. Gabriel followed Gregorios (1604-1614), see *Codex Alpha*, pp. 21, 20, 26, 47, 70.

Gabriel is unknown to Mystakides (*Katalogoi*) and to Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, VIII, 1108). The latter lists no one between Konstantios and Gregorios, both cited in 1608, and Kornelios, cited in 1622. The Gabriel listed between 1635-1652 is not the same person above. Ateses (II, 119-20) lists Gabriel in "1610 or from 1618-1621." Gabriel later became a Roman Catholic.

2. A Dionysios served Chios in the beginning of the sixteenth century and another in the middle of the eighteenth century. Therefore I am inclined to believe that the name is due to someone practicing.

26 (33, 17)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kyrillos I

December 7130 [1621], Indiction 5

Hieromonk Ioasaph is elected Archbishop of Domenikon & Elasson¹ to succeed Neophytos² who absconded with the funds of his see during the tenure of Patriarch Timotheos II and had returned without permission when Patriarch Kyrillos I took office. Later Neophytos died.

Other candidates: Hieromonk Paisios and Hieromonk Maximos.

†Timotheos of Heraklia, †Meletios of Drystra,³ Parthenios of Ainos,⁴ †Euthymios of Phanarion,⁵ . . . of . . . , †Melchesedek of Raidesto
Monokondylion. Menologema.

Another Menologema in the text: April, Indiction 3.

1. In the MS: Dec. 1621-6 Mar. 1636, cited as deposed; Nos. 26, 32, 37, 52, 53.

Inclusive dates: Elected, Dec. 1621-1/5 Mar. 1636, deposed. On 23 Aug. 1638 Ioasaph was elected Metropolitan of Korinth which he served until 7 Feb. 1641 when he was deposed.

Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XV, 114) lists Galaktion from May 1589-ca. July 1628; Konstantinides (TEE, V, 547) in 1590, while Ateses (I, 161) lists him from 1590-1628. All are in error since Ioasaph was elected in Dec. 1621 in succession of Neophytos who is unknown to the above three scholars. With regard to

Ioasaph's tenure, the picture is more complicated.

Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XV, 114) cites Ioasaph in July 1628, followed by Philotheos in Apr. 1632, Kallistos from Mar. 1638?, another Ioasaph from ?-23 Aug. 1638, and Germanos from Jan. 1649-Sept. 1655, deposed. Konstantinides (TEE, V, 547) follows Janin except that he lists: "Kallistos 1636-?" Ateses (I, 161) records Ioasaph in 1628, Philotheos in 1632, Ioasaph (without a number and presumably the same) in 1636, Kallistos "1636, deposed," Germanos 1637, 1638, and another Ioasaph who is transferred to Korinth in 1638, with another Kallistos "1646, deposed."

Ioasaph is cited in *Codex Beta* from Dec. 1621-July 1624 (Nos. 26, 32, 37). In *Codex Alpha*, he is cited from 27 June 1628-July/Nov. 1632 (pp. 61, 193, 194, 196, 197, 229, 231, 233, 237). Philotheos, cited by the above mentioned authorities, is probably based on A. E. Lauriotès "Ἀνέκδοτα Σιγίλλια," EA, XII (1892-93), 347-48, where Philotheos is erroneously recorded. The signatures in the document (*Codex Alpha*, p. 61) are by one hand and Ioasaph is very clearly written. Ioasaph, therefore, had a continuous tenure from Dec. 1621-1/5 Mar. 1636 when he was deposed. His successor Kallistos was elected on 6 Mar. 1636 (see below Nos. 52, 53 and Sathas, p. 579). Kallistos served until 22 May 1646 when Germanos succeeded him and he is cited as deposed; Sathas, p. 579. Therefore, Ateses who lists two archbishops named Kallistos is in error as I believe are the dates for Germanos, cited in 1637 and 1638. Ateses gives no reference for the date 1638, but for 1637 he refers to Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, pp. 225-26). There Mystakides reproduces the text of p. 300 of *Codex Alpha* which refers to the uncanonical transfer of Metropolitan Kyrillos, formerly of Korinth, to the Metropolis of Philippoupolis. He erroneously dates this text Mar. 1637 when actually it was written under Patriarch Parthenios I (elected 1 July 1639; see below No. 59) whose *monokondylion* is very clear although the date in the document is not: see Germanos (VII, 185-86) who dates the document after 1 July 1639.

Archbishop Germanos, therefore, interrupted Kallistos' tenure ca. July 1639. The latter was deposed on 22 May 1646; Sathas, p. 579. In *Codex Alpha*, however, a Ioasaph is cited twice in June 1638 (pp. 331, 333) and on 23 Aug. when as the former Archbishop of Domenikon & Elasson he is elected Metropolitan of Korinth; see below No. 64, Sathas, p. 573. I am inclined to believe

this is the same Ioasaph, especially since he is cited as the former at his election to Korinth. He probably neglected to sign as the former in the two citations in 1638.

My list would therefore be as follows: Galaktion 1589-?, Neophytos ?-Dec. 1621, cited as deposed; Ioasaph, elected, Dec. 1621-1/5 Mar. 1636, deposed; Kallistos, elected, 6 Mar. 1636-22 May 1646, deposed, with an interruption by Germanos ca. July 1639; Germanos, elected 22 May 1646-Sept. 1655, cited as deposed; Sathas, p. 591.

2. Inclusive dates: unknown.

Neophytos is unknown to Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XV, 114) Konstantinides (*TEE*, V, 547), and Ateses (I, 161). All list Galaktion as Ioasaph's predecessor.

3. Inclusive dates: Dec. 1621-before 25 June 1623; Aug. 1623-Jan. 1626, deposed. Elected Metropolitan of Philippoupolis on 28 Mar. 1627-25 June 1628; Sathas, 565. See Gritsopoulos, *Archeion*, XIX, 268-69 for the text of his deposition; *Codex Alpha*, pp. 137, 169, 181. Chamoudopoulos, (*EA*, II, 668) erroneously read Philippi & Drama instead of Philippoupolis. See Germanos, VIII, 184. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XIV, 826) lists Meletios "?-Jan. 1626," while Germanos (VIII, 137) attests him in Mar. 1622, Aug. 1623, and in Jan. 1626.

4. In the MS: Dec. 1621- 1 July 1639; Nos. 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 59.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1621-1652, resigned. There is considerable confusion concerning Parthenios' chronology among the authorities. Petrides (*Dictionnaire*, I, 660) lists Parthenios in 1622 and 1624, followed by Ignatios in July 1624, and Parthenios (the same?) in 1624; he resigned in 1652. Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, 156) lists an Ignatios in 1624 and only notes that Parthenios resigned. Germanos (VI, 46, n5) list Parthenios from Jan. 1622-Jan. 1634, adds, with some reservation, a Paisios in Jan. 1634, and attests Parthenios (he is uncertain if it is the same person) in June 1638 and May 1639. He records Parthenios' resignation on 1 Mar. 1652. Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, I, 1081) has the following: Parthenios 1622, Antonios 1626, Gregorios 1632, Parthenios 1652.

Our MS attests Parthenios in Dec. 1621 (No. 26), Jan. 1622 (No. 27), 1 Feb. 1622 (No. 29), May 1622 (No. 32), and if my reading is correct, on 1 July 1639 (No. 59). In *Codex Alpha*, he is

attested from 25 Feb. 1622 (pp. 106-07) to Aug. 1622 (pp. 108-09), from July 1623 (pp. 125-26) to Aug. 1623 (p. 130), and from Apr. 1628 to 6 May 1639.

Paisios, who is said to have interrupted Parthenios in Jan. 1634, should probably be ruled out since Parthenios is also attested in Jan. 1634 (*Codex Alpha*, p. 265). The others, Ignatios in 1624, Antonios in 1626, and Gregorios in 1632 are possible interruptors. Parthenios is not attested in these years. Nevertheless, I would choose to follow Germanos and the MS, and date Parthenios from Dec. 1621 to 1652.

5. In the MS: Dec. 1621-July 1624; Nos. 26, 27, 30, 36.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1621-Oct. 1624, deposed. See *Codex Alpha*, p. 143 for deposition.

Gritsopoulos (TEE, VI, 437) lists Euthymios in 1622 and 1624, while Ateses (I, 176) also cites him in 1632. They seem to be unaware of Euthymios' deposition in Oct. 1624.

27 (35, 18)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kyrillos I

[January] 7130 [1622], Indiction 5

Hieromonk Akakios is elected Metropolitan of Mesemvria¹ to succeed Kyprianos who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Paisios and Hieromonk Euthymios

†Theophanes of Old Patras, †Parthenios of Ainos, Parthenios of Varna,³ Euthymios of Phanarion, †Gregorios of Andros⁴

Menologema

Menologema in the text: July, Indiction 2 repeated twice. In addition, the signature of Philotheos of Siphnos⁵ is repeated twice

at the very bottom of the page and appears to be unrelated to the document.

Resume: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 11; Germanos (VIII, 153, n 8) rightly corrects Papadopoulos-Kerameus who misread Makarios for Kyprianos but is wrong when he dates the document June instead of January. Here Papadopoulos-Kerameus is correct. The reading is ambiguous but since Akakios of Mesembria appears below in No. 30, dated 2 Feb. 1622, the above date should be January.

1. In the MS: Jan. 1622-1/22 July 1641; Nos. 27, 29, 30, 36, 59, 60, 61, 66.

Inclusive dates: Elected, Jan. 1622-1/22 July 1641 when his successor Damaskenos was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 66. Germanos (VIII, 153) erroneously dates Akakios' election in June 1622.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 28 May 1607-Jan. 1622, cited as dead. Germanos, VIII, 153; Sathas, 554.

3. In the MS: Jan. 1622-July 1624; Nos. 27, 30, 36.

Inclusive dates: Jan. 1622-7 Apr. 1635 when his successor Meletios was elected and he is cited as dead. Germanos, VIII, 126. Sathas (p. 571) dates Meletios' election on 8 Apr. 1635. See below No. 62, n 6.

4. In the MS: Jan. 1622-June 1622; Nos. 27, 32, 33, 35.

Inclusive dates: Dec. 1620-19 Dec. 1626 when his successor Makarios was elected and he is cited as deposed. Initial date in *Codex Alpha*, pp. 102-03; Sphyroeras (*TEE*, II, 721) lists Gregorios from 1622-1626, while Petrides (*Dictionnaire*, II, 1511) Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, 160), and Paschales (*TCE*, I, 1111) only list Gregorios' date of deposition.

5. Inclusive dates: Unknown. Philotheos does not appear in any of the episcopal lists.

(To be continued)

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

**THE ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS LIBRARY
OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND HISTORICAL SOURCES**

NO. 2

N. M. Vaporiş, General Editor

**CODEX (Γ') GAMMA
OF THE
ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE**

by

Nomikos Michael Vaporiş

INTRODUCTION

It is my intention to publish a presentation of at least four of the oldest codices from the archives of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, dating from the fall of the City to the Ottoman Turks. Normally, **Codex Alpha**, the oldest, should be presented first, but although its study has been completed for the most part, certain technical difficulties prevent its completion at this time. This is not, fortunately, true of **Codex Gamma**. Hence the possibility of publishing it first.

Codex Gamma originally consisted of seventy-four pages of which two are blank. These were all written during the second and third tenure of Patriarch Kallinikos II Akarnanos by various (at least seven different) scribes. Hence the MS has been referred to as the Codex of Patriarch Kallinikos Akarnanos. To the original seventy-four pages four more were added: two in the beginning, numbered A and B, and two at the end, numbered 75 and 76. Consequently, as the Codex now stands, it numbers seventy-eight pages of which two are still blank.

(Archimandrites Ioakeim Phoropoulos, Chief Archivist of the Patriarchal Archives at the end of the past century and later elected Metropolitan of Melnik and Pelagonia, who wrote a brief description of the MS on what could be considered its "title page" shortly after it received its present binding, failed to add the pages numbered A and B to the total and believed they were the same document copied twice and dated 1764.)

The MS is paper, folio (51.5 by 66 cm.), and was bound at the end of the last century in cloth. Except for pp. A and B, which are badly smudged and faded, the remainder of the MS is in rather good condition and clearly written, except, of course, for the names of the signatories. This is not true where the latter are written by one hand as they are in Nos. 24, 29, 33, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 76, and 86. On the spine of the cover of the MS the following can be read: "1691-1702 | Kodix Hypomenmaton | 1691-1719 | Sigillion G' | 3 | A/3 | Kodix | Hypomenmaton | kai Sigillion | 1691-1719."

The seventy-six pages which contain a text are as follows: the first two, numbered A and B are the youngest and date from July 1761. The remaining pages are numbered 1 through 76 and date from March 1691 to 28 March 1719. The entire MS contains

eighty-nine individual documents, really eighty-eight since the text on pp. 25-26 (No. 33) and pp. 31b-32 (No. 39) is identical. All the documents are copies except for the resignations which are original and were written on much smaller pieces of paper and later pasted on various pages of the MS.

The eighty-eight documents of the Codex can be grouped as follows: thirty elections, eight resignations, five depositions, five grants of stavropegion rank to various monasteries, twelve confirmations of stavropegion rank, eighteen patriarchal declarations, rulings, and exhortations on various problems and people, one letter of absolution, one dealing with an endowment, one joining of two sees, one episcopal pledge, one settlement, one restoration, one exoneration, one invalidation of an election, one permission to marry to a former priest (hieromonk) and one dealing with the sacrament of the Eucharist.

As the MS stands now, pp. 1-74 (March 1691-7 August 1702) were written under Patriarch Kallinikos II; pp. 75-76 (August 1718-28 March 1719) under Patriarch Hieremias III; and pp. A-B (July 1761) under Patriarch Ioannikios III.

In the presentation of the documents, I have included all the personal and place names that appear, offices and monasteries, weights, measures, and currencies, as well as concise but full summary of the document. Whenever possible I have noted who has published the document and who has cited it.

Over all, the MS makes a considerable contribution to the propography (primarily hierarchs) of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. These contributions are pointed out in the notes that follow the documents and in Appendix A at the end of the study.

Initially, I have checked the chronology and the lists of hierarchs with those that appear in the twelve volume *Threskeutike kai Ethike Egkyklopaideia* (Athens, 1962-1968) which includes the latest lists but not always the most reliable, and the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastiques* (Paris, 1912-) unfortunately still in progress. Beyond this, I have used the bibliography that is noted in the study with no attempt to give full bibliographical references. Some bibliography, however, was inaccessible to me, especially that found in various short-lived Greek journals. Nevertheless, I feel that this does not impair the present study in any substantive way.

The first number that appears at the head of each document is my own based on the chronology of the document; the second is

that of the MS. Whenever the letter b accompanies a number of the MS, this means that the document begins on the second half of that page.

Unless accompanied by the election date and the date of death, deposition, or resignation, the phrase in the notes "inclusive dates" indicates the earliest and latest dates known.

A final note on the Index. In the case of the hierarchs, I have listed all the documents in which they appear or are referred to in the notes of the document which cites them for the first time. I have not repeated this in the Index. There only the first number appears. In the case of the sees, I have listed all those numbers whenever the hierarchy has changed.

The following signs have been employed in the study:

- . . . = illegible signatures that I have been unable to decipher.
- [] = material not found in the MS.
- & = used when a see has a double name.
- * = indicates a contribution to the chronology of the hierarchy. Used in Appendix A.
- ** = indicates hierarchy previously unknown. Used in Appendix A.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Aimilianos.

Aimilianos, Metropolitan of Melitos, " Πατριαρχικά Σιγίλλια ἐν τοῖς Κώδιξι τοῦ Ἀρχιεποφυλακίου τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου," Ὁρθοδοξία, XXXIV (1959), pp. 471-94.

Alexoudes, Leukoma.

Anthimos Alexoudes, " Χρονολογικοὶ κατάλογοι τῶν ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ἀρχιερευσάντων κατ' ἐπαρχίας, Πανελλήνιον Λεύκωμα Ἐθνικῆς Ἐκατονταετηρίδος, Vol. VI. Ἐκκλησία-κληρος. Athens, 1922.

Arampatzoglous, Photieios.

Gennadios Arampatzoglou, Φωτίειος Βιβλιοθήκη. 2 vols. Constantinople, 1933-1935.

Archeion,

Ἀρχεῖον τοῦ Θρακικοῦ Λαογραφικοῦ καὶ Γλωσσικοῦ Θησαυροῦ.

Ateses, Lemnos.

Vasileios Ateses, Ἡ Ἱερὰ Μητρόπολις Λήμνου διὰ μέσου τῶν αἰώνων. Athens, 1957.

Chrysanthos, Trapezous.

Chrysanthos, Metropolitan of Trapezous Ἡ Ἐκκλησία Τραπεζοῦντος. Athens, 1933.

Delikanes, II.

Kallinikos Delikanes, Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Ἀρχιεποφυλακίου σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας, Ἀντιοχείας, Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Κύπρου 1574-1863 περισυλλεγόντα καὶ συναρμολογηθέντα κελεύσει τῆς Α.Θ. Παναγιότητος τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἰωακείμ τοῦ Γ'. Constantinople, 1904.

Delikanes, III.

Idem. Πατριαρχικῶν Ἐγγράφων Τόμος Τρίτος ἦτοι Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κώδιξι τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ ἀρχιεποφυλακίου σωζόμενα ἐπίσημα ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἔγγραφα τὰ ἀφορῶντα εἰς τὰς σχέσεις τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου πρὸς τὰς Ἐκκλησίας Ρωσσίας, Βλαχίας καὶ Μολδαβίας, Σερβίας Ἀχριδῶν καὶ Πεκίου 1564-1863 οἷς προστίθεται ἱστορικὴ μελέτη περὶ τῆς Ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς Ἀχριδῶν. Constantinople, 1905.

Dictionnaire.

Dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie ecclesiastiques.
16 vols. Paris, 1912—.

EA. Ἑκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια.

ECH. Ἡπειρωτικὰ Χρονικά.

EPH. Ἑκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος. Alexandria.

EEBS. Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρίας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν.

EEKS. Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρίας Κρητικῶν Σπουδῶν.

Gedeon, Chronika.

Manouel Gedeon, Χρονικά τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ οἴκου καὶ ναοῦ.
Constantinople, 1884.

Gedeon, Diataxeis.

Idem. Κανονικαὶ Διατάξεις. 2 vols. Constantinople, 1888-1889.

Gedeon, Ephemerides.

Idem. Πατριαρχικαὶ ἐφημερίδες. Εἰδήσεις ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας, 1500-1812. Athens, 1936.

Gedeon, Pinakes.

Idem. Πατριαρχικοὶ Ποίνakes. Constantinople, 1890.

Germanos, Orthodoxia.

Germanos, Metropolitan of Sardeis. " Συμβολὴ εἰς τοὺς Πατριαρχικοὺς καταλόγους Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως καὶ ἐξ ἧς", Ὁρθοδοξία, VIII (1933), pp. 252-53, 279-85, 312-20, 345-54, IX (1934), pp. 30-37, 74-82, 118-28, 175-84, 212-20, 251-58, 304-11, 319-27, 355-63, 429-38, 487-96, 517-25, X (1935), pp. 26-34, 94-100, 127-34, 166-73, 191-200, 233-43, 293-301, 310-20, 356-65, 411-18, *ibid.*, XI (1936), pp. 37-45, 86-95, 138-45, 167-73, 198-207, 240-247, 263-71, 337-44, 368-78.

Germanos, Thrakika, VI.

Idem. " Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καὶ Δυτικῆς Θράκης, Θρακικά, VI (1935), pp. 37-136.

Germanos, Thrakika, VIII.

Idem. " Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τῆς Βορείου Θράκης καὶ ἐν γένει τῆς Βουλγαρίας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως καὶ ἐξ ἧς, Θρακικά, VIII (1937), pp. 110-89.

Gritsopoulos, Mone Philosophou.

Tasos Gritsopoulos, Μονή Φιλοσόφου. Athens, 1960.

Historia Patriarchica

Πατριαρχική Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἱστορία. Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn, 1849.

Historia Politica.

Ἱστορία πολιτικὴ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn, 1849.

Hypselantes.

Athanasios Komnenos Hypselantes. Τὰ μετὰ τὴν Ἄλωσιν, 1453-1789. Ed. Germanos Aphthonides. Constantinople, 1870.

Karapiperes.

Chrysostomos Karapiperes. "Καλλίνικος Β' ὁ Ἀκαρνάν," Ἀρχεῖ-
α Ἑταιρείας Αἰτωλοακαρνανικῶν Σπουδῶν, I (1958), pp. 89-
112.

Kourilas, Thrakika.

Eulogios Kourilas, Βιογραφικὸς κατάλογος μητροπολιτῶν
Ἑρακλείας, Θρακικά, XXVIII (1958), pp. 3-282.

Legrand, Bibliographie.

Emile Legrand, Bibliographie hellenique, on description rais-
onnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au XVII siecle.
vols. I-V. Paris, 1894-1903.

Meletios, Historia.

Meletios, Metropolitan of Athens, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἱστορία
περιέχων τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας τὴν ἀκολουθήσιν ἀπὸ
ἀπὸ τοὺς χιλίους διακοσίους χρόνους τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Γεννή-
σεως ἕως τοὺς χιλίους ἑπτακοσίους. Ed. by G. Vendotes,
vol. III. Vienna, 1784.

Mystakides, Katalogoi.

Vasileios Mystakides, "Ἐπισκοπικοὶ κατάλογοι," Ed. G.
Konidares. EEBS, XII (1936), pp. 139-206.

NP. Νέος Ποιμὴν. Constantinople.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Analekta.

A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Ἀνέλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Στα-
χυολογίας. 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1891-1898.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke.

Idem. Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἢ Κατάλογος τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου
ἀποστολικοῦ τε καὶ καθολικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου θρόνου τῶν Ἱερο-
σολύμων καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης ἀποκειμένων ἑλληνικῶν κω-
δίκων. 4 vols. St. Petersburg, 1891.

Runciman, Great Church.

Steven Runciman. **The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence.** London, 1968.

TEE.

Θρησκευτική καὶ Ἠθική Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια. 12 vols. Athens, 1962-1968.

Vaporis, Aspects.

Nomikos M. Vaporis. **Some Aspects of the History of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.** New York, 1969.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Archimandrites, highest ecclesiastical title given to ordained monks, usually to heads of monasteries. At present, freely and generally bestowed upon almost all celibate priests. Literally, head of the flock.

Archons, laymen of prominence, recognized as leaders among the Greeks. Status after 1453 due primarily to wealth and/or influence at the Sublime Porte.

Aslania, Turkish arslan or aslan, an Ottoman gold dollar.

Aspers, Greek aspron; Turkish akce. An Ottoman silver coin.

Berat, an official document of appointment issued to all hierarchs by the Ottoman government. The fee attached to it varied according to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and time. It proved to be one of the principal causes of the great indebtedness of the Patriarchate and the Church in general.

Charatsi, Turkish kharadj, poll-tax paid by Christians to the Ottoman government. Also an annual tax paid by the Patriarchate to the Ottomans.

Chrysovoullon, an imperial decree issued by the Byzantine emperors bearing a gold seal.

Emvatikion, fee paid to the hierarch by clergymen at the time of their appointment.

Ephemerios, clergyman responsible for performing the church services in a particular church; chaplain.

Exarchate, an ecclesiastical jurisdiction composed of one or more villages or one or more islands, often unable to support an hierarch, under the direct jurisdiction of the Patriarchate.

Gerontes, elders, lay leaders of the Greek communities.

Grosia, piastres, Turkish kurus, an Ottoman gold coin.

Hagiasma, a source of sanctified water over which usually a church or a chapel has been built.

Hegoumenos, a head of a monastery; **hegoumene**, the feminine form.

Hierodeacon, another title for a deacon.

Hierarchs (s), one of episcopal rank; metropolitan, archbishop, or bishop.

Hieromonk, a monk in priestly orders.

Kanonikon, fee paid by each family and clergyman to the hierarch.

Kontarion, a measure of weight.

Menologema, an elaborate inscription of the date; month and indiction.

Metochi; pl. **metochia**, ecclesiastical property (church, monastery, fields, etc.) separated geographically from its owner.

Monoepiskopos, an hierarch who has been elected to and has held only one ecclesiastical see.

Monokondyilion, an elaborate inscription of a patriarch's full title at the head of a patriarchal document. For the Patriarch of Constantinople: (N) by the Grace of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch.

Okas (des), Turkish weight, 2.83 pounds.

Officials, holders of ecclesiastical offices (**officia**) in the Church of Constantinople and other hierarchical sees. In the Patriarchate, the most important offices, beginning in the seventeenth century, are held by laymen.

Panegyria, literally, feast day celebrations; here, fee paid to the ecclesiastical head upon the occasion of such a celebration.

Philotimon, fee paid to a newly elected patriarch and metropolitan by hierarchs subject to them. Later hierarchs were required to pay the **philotimon** to the general treasury as well. The fee was also extended to clergymen and laymen, payable to their hierarch.

Pneumatikos, literally, spiritual; a priest who has been granted the right to hear confessions.

Portaris(s)a, feminine of **portares**, door keeper or ostiarios.

Proedros, administrator. A title given to an hierarch who administers a see without assuming its name officially.

Proestos; pl. **proestotes**, elders; also **archons**.

Prohegoumenos, another name for an **hegoumenos** or head of a monastery.

Protosynkelos, chancellor of an episcopal see.

Sakellaris(s)a, feminine of **sakellarios** or treasurer.

Sigillion, a patriarchal letter duly signed and marked with a seal.

Skevophylakis(s)a, feminine of **skevophylax** or keeper of sacred vessels.

Stavropegion, a monastery in whose foundations a cross has been set. Such monasteries were under the direct authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople and, consequently, free of hierarchical jurisdiction.

Synoikesia, fees due to the hierarch of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction from marriage contracts.

Tomos, an official ecclesiastical document pertaining to rather important matters and expressing the mind of the Church.

Voetheia, a fee paid by hierarchs to the Patriarchate.

Zetia (zeteia), an irregular fee imposed upon hierarchs by the Patriarchate to help pay the general indebtedness of the Church. The amount varied with the debt.

TABLE OF THE REGESTA

1. (1-3)	Transubstantiation and the Eucharist	Mar. 1691
2. (5)	Election: Konstantios of Rhodes	Mar. 1692
3. (6)	Confirmation: St. John the Baptist, Verroia	June 1692
4. (7)	Election: Makarios of Paronaxia	Aug. 1695
5. (7b)	Election: Iakovos of Neokaisaria & Ineon	Sept. 1695
6. (8-9)	Grant of Stavropegion Rank: Hagia Zone, Samos	Feb. 1696
7. (9b)	Election: Gennadios of Nikaia	Apr. 1696
8. (10)	Deposition and Unfrocking: Methodios of Thessalonike	1/2 Apr. 1696
9. (11)	Election: Ignatios of Thessalonike	2 Apr. 1696
10. (14)	Resignation: Makarios of Tzia & Thermia	3 Apr. 1696
11. (12)	Resignation: Gregorios of Chios	31 May 1696
12. (12b)	Election: Gennadios of Chios	31 May 1696
13. (11b)	Election: Neophytos of Sevestia	June 1696
14. (13)	Resignation: Ioasaph of Amasia	2 June 1696
15. (13b)	Election: Ioannikios of Amasia	June 1696
16. (14b)	Election: Vartholomaïos of Tzia & Thermia	June 1696
17. (16b)	Resignation: Iakovos of Neokaisaria & Ineon	19 Dec. 1696
18. (15)	Deposition and Unfrocking: Philotheos of Ellason & Domenikon	Jan. 1697
19. (16)	Election: Zacharias of Ellason & Domenikon	16 Jan. 1697
20. (17)	Election: Gregorios of Neokaisaria & Ineon	17 Jan. 1697
21. (18)	Deposition and Unfrocking: Meletios of Naupaktos & Arta	Feb. 1697
22. (19)	Election: Makarios of Naupaktos & Arta	19 Feb. 1697
23. (19b)	Election: Neilos of Metra & Athyra	19 Feb. 1697
24. (20)	Patriarchal Declaration	May 1697
25. (21)	Resignation: Makarios of Naupaktos & Arta	July 1697
26. (21b)	Election: Gregorios of Naupaktos & Arta	5 July 1697

27. (22)	Election: Galaktion of Lemnos	27 Sept. 1697
28. (22b)	Election: Neophytos of Santorine	26 Nov. 1697
29. (17b)	Patriarchal Ruling	Jan. 1698
30. (23)	Election: Kyprianos of Smyrna	15 June 1698
31. (24)	Patriarchal Ruling	Aug. 1698
32. (24b)	A False Bishop	Aug. 1698
33. (25-26)	Confirmation: St. John the Baptist	Aug. 1698
34. (26b-27)	Patriarchal Ruling	Aug. 1698
35. (28-29)	Letter of Absolution	Aug. 1698
36. (29b)	Election: Makarios of Lemnos	28 Aug. 1698
37. (30)	Patriarchal Ruling	Aug. 1698
38. (30b-31)	Joining of Sees	Oct. 1698
39. (31b-32)	Confirmation: St. John the Baptist	Nov. 1698
40. (23b)	Election: Gregorios of Andros	17 Feb. 1699
41. (33)	A Pledge: Zosimas, formerly of Achrida	Mar. 1699
42. (33b-34)	Patriarchal Ruling	1699
43. (35-36)	Confirmation: Theotokos Vernikova	May 1699
44. (36b)	Patriarchal Ruling	June 1699
45. (34b)	Settlement	June 1699
46. (37-38)	Confirmation: St. John Skopelos	Aug. 1699
47. (38b-39)	Restoration: Arsenios of Kydonia	Aug. 1699
48. (39b-40)	Confirmation: Batzkovon, Philippoupolis	Sept. 1699
49. (43)	Exoneration	Sept. 1699
50. (43b-44)	Patriarchal Ruling	Sept. 1699
51. (41)	Declaration	12 Oct. 1699
52. (44b)	False Bishop	Oct. 1699
53. (42)	Confirmation: St. Konstantinos, Naupaktos & Arta	Nov. 1699
54. (47)	Confirmation: Transfiguration, Strophades	Jan. 1700
55. (48)	Patriarchal Ruling	Jan. 1700
56. (48b)	Resignation: Neophytos of Santorine	25 Apr. 1700
57. (45)	Election: Zacharias of Santorine	25 Apr. 1700
58. (45-46)	Confirmation: St. Nicholas, Santorine	Apr. 1700
59. (49)	Invalidation of Election	Apr. 1700
60. (50)	Election: Makarios of Anchialos	28 Apr. 1700
61. (50b-51)	Patriarchal Ruling	May 1700
62. (53)	Confirmation: Evangelistria, Thebes	May 1700

63.	(54)	Confirmation: Theotokos Kosiniate, Serres	July 1700
64.	(55)	Grant of Stavropegion Rank: St. George, Melos	Sept. 1700
65.	(56)	Grant of Stavropegion Rank: Theotokos Eoni, Reon	Jan. 1701
66.	(57)	Patriarchal Ruling	Jan. 1701
67.	(57b-58)	Confirmation: St. Anastasia, Thessalonike	Jan. 1701
68.	(58b-59)	Confirmation: Phaneromene, Korinth	Jan. 1701
69.	(59b)	Election: Neophytos of Melos & Kimelos	3 Feb. 1701
70.	(60)	Permission to Marry	May 1701
71.	(61)	Deposition and Unfrocking: Makarios of Selyvria	May 1701
72.	(62)	Resignation: Makarios of Selyvria	10 May 1701
73.	(63)	Election: Leontios of Selyvria	May 1701
74.	(64)	Resignation: Gregorios of Sophia	18 May 1701
75.	(64b)	Election: Anastasios of Sophia	23 May 1701
76.	(72)	Granting of Stavropegion Rank: St. George, Trapezous	June 1701
77.	(65-66)	Patriarchal Ruling	1701
78.	(66b-68)	Patriarchal Rulings	2 Aug. 1701
79.	(68b-69)	Granting of Stavropegion Rank: Ascension, Patras	Aug. 1701
80.	(70)	Deposition and Unfrocking: Gregorios of Philippi & Drama	Sept.-Dec. 1701
81.	(73b)	Election: Kallinikos of Sozopolis	16 Dec. 1701
82.	(74)	Election: Euthymios of Pogoniane	1 Mar. 1702
83.	(74b)	Election: Theokletos of Proikonesos	15 Mar. 1702
84.	(71)	Election: Symeon of Xanthe & Peritheorion	7 Aug. 1702
85.	(71b)	Election: Dionysios of Amasia	7 Aug. 1702
86.	(75)	Endowment: St. Nicholas of Wallachia	Aug. 1718
87.	(76)	Election: Kosmas of Pisidia	28 Mar. 1719
88.	(A)	Patriarchal Exhortation	July 1761
89.	(B)	Patriarchal Exhortation	July 1761

1 (1-3)

TRANSUBSTANTIATION AND THE EUCHARIST

Patriarchikon synodikon kai systatikon gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II¹

[March] 1691 [Indiction 14]

The Holy Synod,² composed of Patriarch Kallinikos II,³ Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem,⁴ hierarchs,⁵ officials,⁶ archons,⁷ learned men, and teachers, affirms and declares that the word *metousiosis* (transubstantiation) is not a borrowing from the "heretical sophistries of the Latins," but is genuinely Orthodox. Its true meaning has been expounded and has been used by many Orthodox such as Patriarch Gennadios II Scholarios,⁸ Bishop Maximos Margounios of Kythera,⁹ Patriarch Meletios Pegas of Alexandria,¹⁰ Metropolitan Gabriel of Philadelphia,¹¹ Theologian of the Church George Koresios,¹² Patriarch Nektarios of Jerusalem,¹³ Teacher of the Church Meletios Syrigos,¹⁴ and many others too numerous to cite."

Syrigos has demonstrated that the word *metousiosis* is Orthodox in his "Orthodox Confession,"¹⁵ which has been confirmed by the Ecumenical Throne¹⁶ with the assent of the other Orthodox Patriarchs. In his other work against the so-called "Kyrillian Chapters,"¹⁷ Syrigos condemns those who believe only in the spiritual presence of Jesus Christ in the *mysterion* (sacrament) of the Holy Eucharist, those who hold to His imaginary presence, as well as those who hold the Calvinist heresy in general. The same was done by the Holy Synod held in Constantinople [1642] under Patriarch Parthenios I the Elder.¹⁸

Moreover, the Holy Synod declares that the "Holy and Catholic Church of Christ has, from the time of the Holy Apostles up to the present, believed and advocated that after the sanctification of the bread and wine, they are transformed and changed; the bread into the true body of Christ that was born of the Virgin; the wine

into the true blood of the Lord and Savior God, spilled on the Cross.”

In addition, the word *metousiosis* means nothing else but *metavole* (change). Finally, anyone who in any way accepts the un-Orthodox teaching of the pamphlets advocating heresy is, if a clergyman, automatically deposed and anathematized without any hearing; if a layman, he is excommunicated.

†Kallinikos, by the grace of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch¹⁹

†Dositheos, by the grace of God, Patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem²⁰ assents in everything

†Theophanes of Ephesos,²¹ †Kyrillos of Kyzikos,²² Gabriel of Chalkedon,²³ †Parthenios of Rhodes,²⁴ †Kyprianos of Kaisaria,²⁵ †Athanasios of Drystra,²⁶ †Gregorios of Chios,²⁷ †Theodoretos, formerly of Lakedaimonia,²⁸ †Pachomios of Raidesto,²⁹ †. . . of . . ., †Grand Oikonomos George the priest,³⁰ †. . . Konstantis the priest, †Grand Logothetes Ioannes (John),³¹ †Grand Chartophylax Alexander,³² †Grand Ekklesiarches Ralakes,³³ †Dikaiophylax Spantones,³⁴ †Logothetes Chourmouzos,³⁵ †Rhetor Manouel,³⁶ †Konstantinos Tzoukes, †Drakos Eupragiotes,³⁷ Aristarchos, Demetrakes Razos, Thomas Tzoukes,³⁸ Kapikechagias Anastasios,³⁹ Theodorakes Keramakes, Diamantes of Paraskevas, Stamates of Triantaphyllos

Monokondyliion

Text: Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 99-105. Gedeon omits Kyprianos of Kaisaria; Ioannes Karmires, *Ta dogmatika kai symvolika mnemeia tes Orthodoxou Katholikes Ekklesias* (Athens, 1953), II, 779-83. Karmires omits all lay signatories beginning with Konstantinos Tzoukes. For an English translation, see George Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century, Being the Correspondence Between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops* (London, 1868), pp. 67-76.

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 611; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 383-84; Karapiperes, p. 108.

1. Patriarchs and other members of the episcopacy of the Orthodox Church are not generally known by numbers as are the popes for example. They are usually identified, in the case of the patriarchs, by the see from which they were elected to the patriarchal office, by a surname, or by a sobriquet. Consequently, numbers do not appear in the MS but have been added for greater clarity. See Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 55-56 and Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, VIII (1933), 281, n 7.

2. The term Holy Synod is often encountered, as would be expected, in patriarchal and other ecclesiastical documents. Usually it means the body of metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, and holders of ecclesiastical officia (offices) meeting with the patriarch to attend to the business of the Church. Here, however, the reference is to the Council held in Constantinople in March 1691. This was the fifth council held in the seventeenth century, provoked primarily by the clash between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism in the lands of the Orthodox Patriarchates.

One of the main issues discussed at the Council of 1691 was the question of the nature of the Eucharist. The anti-Roman Catholic "party" within the Patriarchate of Constantinople, represented by Patriarch Kyrillos I Loukaris and his followers, had rejected the use of the term transubstantiation in formulating the Orthodox theological position on the Eucharist. Their opponents, represented by such people as Meletios Syrigos, Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem, and others--all influenced to some degree by Roman Catholic theology--insisted that the term was Orthodox and as such did not imply all that the Roman Catholics attributed to it. In addition, they tended to look upon those Orthodox who denied its use for Orthodox theology with suspicion and attributed to them a Calvinistic prejudice. Grand Logothetes Ioannes (John) Karyophylles, a student of Theophilos Korydalleus, was one of those suspected and accused of Calvinism, especially with regard to the Eucharist.

Karyophylles' writings on the Eucharist had been publically condemned by Patriarch Parthenios II (1648-1651) decades before, while during the above council other theological tracts written by him were burned. Moreover, Karyophylles was soon to lose his office and would abandon Constantinople for Wallachia.

The Council of 1691 was the last held by the Orthodox Church as a consequence of the fascinating but very controversial career

of Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris and the more general Orthodox-Calvinist encounter.

For the details and documents of the Council, see Karmires, *Mnemeia*, II, 773-83. Very illuminating is the short study of Germanos of Thyateira, *Kyrillos Loukaris, 1572-1638: A Struggle for Preponderance between Catholic and Protestant Powers in the Orthodox East* (London, 1951). The biased work of George Hadjantonitou, *Protestant Patriarch, The Life of Cyril Lucaris, 1572-1638* (Richmond, Va., 1961) should be balanced by Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Kyrillos Loukaris* (2d ed., Athens, 1939) and Gunnar Hering, *Oecumenisches Patriarchat und Europäische Politik, 1620-1638* (Wiesbaden, 1968). For Karyophylles, see the brief account in Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 18-19 and Karapiperes, pp. 94-95. On the question of transubstantiation, see Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 8-16.

3. In the MS Patriarch Kallinikos II appears or is referred to in all documents except in Nos. 86, 87, 88, 89. He served as patriarch thrice: 3 Mar. - 27 Nov. 1688; 7 Mar. 1689 - July/Aug. 1693; and Apr. 1694 - Aug. 1702. Patriarch Kallinikos is generally admitted to have been a good and able patriarch. He was one of the few who died in office. Previous to his election as patriarch, he served as Metropolitan of Prousa (Bursa) from 1672-3 Mar. 1688. Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, X (1935), 315-20, 356-57; Phoropoulos, *TEE*, X, 679; Karapiperes, pp. 90-112; and Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 75.

4. Formerly Metropolitan of Kaisaria in Palestine, Dositheos II was Patriarch of Jerusalem from 1669-1707. For a short biographical sketch, see Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 56-57.

5. A collective name for those of episcopal rank: patriarch, metropolitan, archbishop, and bishop.

6. Holders of ecclesiastical offices in the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other sees. In the Patriarchate, the most important offices, beginning in the seventeenth century, were held by laymen.

7. Laymen of prominence, recognized as leaders in the Greek community. Their status during the Ottoman period was due primarily to wealth and or influence at the Sublime Porte.

8. Patriarch Gennadios was the first Patriarch of Constantinople after the fall of the city to the Ottoman Turks. Made captive during the pillaging of the city, he was taken to Adrianople, then capitol of the Ottoman state, but was held only for a short time.

When his identity became known, Gennadios was returned to Constantinople and, against his will, was elected patriarch by a synod of hierarchs. He was enthroned as patriarch on 6 January 1454. The patriarchal insignia of office were bestowed upon him by Sultan Mehmed II, who consciously acted the part hitherto reserved for the Byzantine emperor.

Gennadios was not unknown to Mehmed who obviously approved of the patriarch's opposition to the union between Constantinople and Rome which had been consummated at the Council of Florence only fourteen years before the capture of the city. Moreover, Mehmed is said to have visited Gennadios while in office and showed him considerable favor. Nevertheless, this did not influence Gennadios' tenure as patriarch which was as relatively brief and stormy as was his life as layman and monk.

Born Georgios Kourtesis or Kortios in Constantinople about the year 1405, Gennadios became a student of Markos Eugenikos, later Metropolitan of Ephesos and the opponent of the Latins at Florence. Unlike most Greeks, Gennadios knew Latin well—he translated some of the works of Thomas Aquinas—besides having mastered theology, philosophy, and rhetoric. Still a layman, he preached regularly at court, taught in his own school, and served the Byzantine empire as imperial secretary and Judge General of the Greeks.

Gennadios began as a supporter of union with Rome and continued as one until just before the death (in 1445) of his teacher Markos Eugenikos, who convinced him to assume the leadership of the anti-Unionists. This role was not to the liking of the new and last Byzantine emperor, Konstantinos XI Palaiologos Dragases (1448-1453), who expelled Gennadios from court and forced him to become a monk.

When elected patriarch, the patriarchal throne had been vacant since 1450, the year Patriarch Gregorios had gone to Rome and never returned. Gennadios was ordained deacon, priest, and bishop within a few days. And although peace had been restored to Constantinople, the new patriarch personally was to enjoy very little of it. In April 1456, just over two years following his election, Gennadios retired and went to live in the Monastery of St. John the Forerunner near Serres in Macedonia.

Gennadios tried very hard to restore order within the Church but already in his reign Greek laymen—archons—in the service of the Ottoman court began to influence the history of the Patriar-

chate. He attempted to relax the marriage canons of the Church in order to prevent conversions to Islam but was bitterly opposed by those who demanded strict adherence to the letter of the law. He did manage to reorganize the Patriarchal Academy, recognizing the important need of a higher institution of learning for the training of the future leaders of the Church.

Patriarch Gennadios died sometime after 1472 but not before he was recalled twice to the patriarchal throne, once in the spring of 1463, and the last time, in August 1464. His first recall had terminated about the end of 1463, while the second lasted only until the autumn of 1465.

Gennadios managed to secure important privileges and concessions from the Ottomans, important not only for the survival of the Church but also for the Orthodox Christian populations as well. But it cannot be said that his tenure as patriarch was very successful.

For Gennadios' chronology as patriarch, see Chrestos Patrinelys, *Ho Theodoros Agallianos kai hoi anekdotoi logoi tou* (Athens, 1966), pp. 64 and n 323, 67-68, n332. Patrinelys rightly emphasizes that lay interference in patriarchal affairs begins with Gennadios and is not only a phenomenon of later centuries; *ibid*, pp. 71-85. In English, a good study of Gennadios can be found in Joseph Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 79-94. Konstantinos Bones in *TEE*, IV, 274-89, is overly critical and very uneven. See too Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, VIII (1933), pp. 279-85 and *Orthodoxia*, X (1935), 362-65, 411-13; Runciman, *Great Church*, pp. 168-85; and the older works by Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 471-79, and Meletios, *Historia*, pp. 330-31. For Gennadios' literary output, see L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès, M. Jugie (eds.), *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios* (8 vols. Paris, 1928-1936). Patriarch Gennadios still awaits his biographer.

9. C. 1549-1602. One of Kyrillos Loukaris' teachers in Padua, Italy, Maximos Margounios has been described as "the most outstanding figure in the intellectual and theological history of the Greek Orthodox Church during the later sixteenth century;" Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West, Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance: Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Culture* (Oxford, 1966), p. 165.

Like so many outstanding figures in the Greek world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Margounios was born in

Krete and studied in Italy. He was elected Bishop of Kythera but the Venetian government refused to permit him to take up his episcopal duties on the island, then under Venetian rule. Instead, he was given a subsidy and was required to spend the remainder of his life in Venice where he taught.

Margounios tried unsuccessfully to find a mutually acceptable solution to the controversy over the filioque addition to the Creed. He was vehemently opposed in this by Gabriel Severos who, as Metropolitan of Philadelphia, was his ecclesiastical superior. Metropolitan Gabriel suspended him. Margounios' conciliatory attitude and views brought him into difficulties with Rome as well. Pope Clement VIII asked that he be tried by the Inquisition. The Venetian government however refused to permit this and Margounios lived free of Papal interference. Later, he became reconciled with Severos and the Patriarchate which also had become aroused over his theological efforts.

For Margounios' career in general, see Geanakoplos, *Greek East*, pp. 165-93, *Patrineles*, TEE, IV, 118, and Giorgio Fedalto, *Massimo Margunio* (Brescia, 1967), with bibliography.

10. Served as Patriarch of Alexandria from 5 Aug. 1690-13 Sept. 1601 and as Administrator of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from 26 Mar. 1597-Mar. 1598.

Meletios Pegas was born in Krete in 1549 and studied in Padua. He became a monk upon his return to Krete in the Monastery of Angaranthos, whose hegoumenos was Sergios, later elected Patriarch of Alexandria under the name of Silvestros (1569-18/19 Feb. 1590). Meletios succeeded the latter as hegoumenos, but his career in Krete was cut short by the Venetians who exiled him.

Meletios traveled to Egypt where he became protosynkelos of Patriarch Silvestros. Later, he was sent to Constantinople to confer with Patriarch Hieremias II over the question of the Gregorian calendar which the Orthodox Church rejected at the time. Meletios remained in Constantinople where he preached extensively until he reluctantly returned to Alexandria to succeed Silvestros as patriarch on 5 Aug. 1690.

As Patriarch, Meletios returned to Constantinople in 1593 to participate in the synod held to confirm the establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow, initiated in 1589 by Patriarch Hieremias II. Twice Meletios was invited to become Patriarch of Constantinople but refused and instead nominated Gabriel Severos and Maximos Margounios who also refused. On a third occasion,

Meletios agreed to serve as administrator of the Ecumenical Throne.

A man of broad vision, Patriarch Meletios tried to affect a union with the Copts in Egypt and with the Church of Ethiopia, but was unsuccessful. He authored a number of books and was extremely active in thwarting Roman propaganda in the Near East. Patriarch Meletios died a young man, but not before securing Kyrillos Loukaris, his relative, as his successor in the see of Alexandria. See Phoropoulos, *TEE*, VIII, 950-56; Gerasimos Mazarakes, *Symvole eis ten historia tes en Aigypto Orthodoxou Ekklesias* (ed. E. Michaelides. Alexandria, 1932), pp. 130-74; Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Historia tes Ekklesias Alexandreias, 62-1934* (Alexandria, 1935), pp. 612-68.

11. July 1577-21 Oct. 1616. Gabriel Severos of Philadelphia shared the theological limelight in the Orthodox world with Margounios in the sixteenth century. Born in Monemvasia in 1541, he studied in Padua and served the Greek Community of Venice as a teacher. Although elected Metropolitan of Philadelphia in Asia Minor, he never assumed episcopal duties there, but returned to Venice after his ordination and remained in the West until his death. When Gabriel refused to go to Asia Minor, the Patriarchate appointed him exarch of Italy and Dalmatia and permitted him to retain his title. Thereafter the hierarch representing the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Western Europe assumed the title of Metropolitan of Philadelphia. It appears that from that time on the town of Philadelphia was considered too poor to support a bishop.

Metropolitan Gabriel spent some forty years in Venice during which time he was on good relations with Venice except once when he was accused of treason. But he was found innocent and the incident passed. Throughout his life he remained a staunch opponent of the Roman Church despite his amicable relations with the Venetian government. Gabriel died on 21 Oct. 1616 while on tour in Dalmatia. See Patrinelis, *TEE*, IV, 117-19 and Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East*, pp. 121-22; 169-72.

12. A medical doctor, philosopher, and theologian, Koresios was born in Chios c. 1566 and died there c. 1660. He studied in Pisa where later he taught Greek. In Italy he was befriended by the Medici family and practiced medicine in Livorno and Marseilles.

Returning to Chios, he both taught and practiced his profession.

Koresios was often used by the Patriarchate, which gave him the title of "Theologian of the Great Church of Christ," to counter Calvinistic propaganda. He also joined in the anti-Roman struggle as well.

Author of many unpublished works, Koresios also wrote an encomium of the Neomartyr Theophilos the sailor who was martyred by the Ottomans in Chios in 1635. See P. G. Nikolopoulos, TEE, VII, 835-36; Konstantinos Amantos, *Ta grammata eis ten Chion kata ten Tourkokratian* (Piraeus, 1946), pp. 81-93 and Konstantinos Sathas, *Neohellenike Philologia. . 1453-1821* (Athens, 1868), pp. 247-50.

13. Born Nicholas Pelopides in 1602 in Krete, Nektarios studied at the School of St. Catherine in his homeland. Later he became a student of Theophilos Korydalleus in Athens.

Nektarios joined the monastery of Mt. Sinai, whose hegoumenos he became following the death of Archbishop Ioasaph. In 1661 he was elected Patriarch of Jerusalem, serving until Jan. 1669.

Patriarch Nektarios was active in founding schools and in caring for the Church of the Resurrection in Jerusalem. He authored a number of works, including a history of Jerusalem and one on the Papacy; N. E. Tzirakes, TEE, IX, 396-97.

14. 1586-13 Apr. 1663. Perhaps the only outstanding man of his generation who was not made bishop--why is not known--Syrigos was born in Krete and studied with the monk Meletios Vlastos at the school of St. Catherine in Chandax (Candia), Krete. Further studies were pursued by Meletios in Venice with Korydalleus and then in Padua where he became a doctor of medicine.

Returning to Krete, he became a monk, changed his name from Markos to Meletios and later was ordained priest. Because of his preaching, he was forced to leave Krete by the Venetians. He traveled to Alexandria in 1626 where he served Patriarch Gerasimos I, also a Kretan. In 1630 he was invited to Constantinople by Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris, another Kretan, who gave him the title of "Preacher of the Great Church of Christ." Syrigos did most of his preaching in the Church of Chrysopege in Galata. (Many of the sermons preached there have been published and continue to have considerable merit.)

In Constantinople Meletios opened a school and numbered among his pupils Nikousios, later first Greek Grand Dragoman of the Porte. In 1642 Syrigos represented Patriarch Parthenios I at

the Council of Jassy where he revised the **Confession** written by Metropolitan Peter Moghila of Kiev and then translated it into Greek.

While Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris was alive, Syrigos was an active anti-Papist, but following Loukaris' death, he diverted his attention to those he suspected of Calvinistic sympathy and violently opposed the introduction of the modern Greek translation of the Scriptures.

In June 1645 he was exiled by Patriarch Parthenios II with whom he quarreled. On occasion he would return to Constantinople in secret from Moldavia, his place of exile. But after Patriarch Parthenios was hanged by the Ottomans, Meletios was able to return permanently. He continued with his preaching and writing. The date of his death is not known. Nikolopoulos, TEE, XI, 596.

15. That is, **Orthodoxos homologia tes pisteos tes Katholikes kai Apostolikes Ekklesias tes Antolikes**; Nikolopoulos, TEE, XI, 596 and Legrand, *Bibliographie*, II, 202-08.

16. Ecumenical Throne, Patriarchate of Constantinople, The Great Church of Christ, The Great Church, the Ecumenical Patriarchate, etc. are all names frequently used to refer to the Church of Constantinople.

17. Reference to, **Tou Makaritou Meletiου Syrigou, didaskalou te kai protosyggelou tes en Konstantinoupolei Megales Ekklesias, kata ton Kalvinikon Kephalaion kai eroteseon Kyrillou tou Loukareos, Antirresis**. . . (Bucarest, 1690) which was a response to the **Confessio fidei reverendissimi domini Cyrilli Patriarchae Constantinopolitani nomine et consensu Patriarcharum Alexandrini et Hierosolymitani, aliorumque Ecclesiarum orientalium Antistitum, scripta**. (Constantiniopoli, mense Martio anni 1629) Geneva, 1629. See Legrand, *Bibliographie*, II, 458-59; III, 267-72.

18. On 1 July 1639 Parthenios I succeeded Kyrillos II Kontares as Patriarch of Constantinople after the latter had been put to death by the Ottoman authorities. Parthenios, also called "Geron" was Metropolitan of Adrianople (1623-1 July 1639) and before that Metropolitan of Anchialos (1621-1623).

Patriarch Parthenios sponsored the Council of Jassy but otherwise had a rather turbulent tenure of office. He was deposed in September 1644 and exiled to Cyprus and later to Chios where he died from poisoning in 1646. See G. E. Metallenos, TEE, X, 56; Meletios, *Historia*, p. 449; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 569-72.

19. The usual form of the patriarchal signature: hereafter abbreviated to Patriarch (N) of Constantinople.

20. The same for the Patriarch of Jerusalem and of other patriarchates and sees.

21. In the MS: Mar. 1691-June 1696; Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16. Inclusive dates: 1688-1697; Anonymous, **TEE**, V, 1150; Alexoudes, **Leukoma**, p. 108. Cf. Janin, **Dictionnaire**, XV, 560.

22. In the MS: Mar. 1691-7 Aug. 1702: Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 37, 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: 1 Sept. 1684-4 Dec. 1711, elected Patriarch of Constantinople as Kyrillos IV. As patriarch Kyrillos served until the beginning of Nov. 1713 and died in 1728 of the plague. Gritsopoulos, **TEE**, VII, 1192-93; Germanos, **Orthodoxia**, X (1935), 496-98; Janin, **Dictionnaire**, XIII, 1195; and Vaporis, **Aspects**, p. 58.

23. In the MS: Mar. 1691-7 Aug. 1702: Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: 1688- Aug. 1702, elected Patriarch of Constantinople as Gabriel III.

Gabriel, who succeeded Kallinikos II, was a pious, able, well educated but conservative patriarch. He condemned the modern translation of the Bible in 1703. Gabriel died in office in Oct. 1707. Gritsopoulos, **TEE**, IV, 110-11; Janin, **Dictionnaire**, XII, 276; Stavrides, **TEE**, XII, 53-54; Gedeon, **Diataxeis**, XI, 106-35; Germanos, **Orthodoxia**, X (1935), 415-18, 450-52.

24. In the MS: Mar. 1691-just before Mar. 1692 when he was elected Metropolitan of Nikomedia. Inclusive dates: 1676-about Mar. 1692, transferred to Nikomedia. **Ē. I. Konstantinides**, **TEE**, X, 820. See, too, below No. 2, n 2.

25. In the MS: Mar. 1691-15 Mar. 1702; Nos. 1, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691-25 Oct. 1707, elected Patriarch of Constantinople. As patriarch, Kyprianos served until the end of May 1709 and returned for a second time on 7 Nov. 1713-28 Feb. 1714; Germanos, **Orthodoxia**, X (1935), 454-57; Nikolo-poulos, **TEE**, 1115; Vaporis, **Aspects**, p. 86. Janin (**Dictionnaire**, XII, 202) has a question mark for the beginning of Kyprianos'

tenure in Kaisaria. Alexoudes (*Leukoma*, p. 108) begins Kyprianos' service in Kaisaria in 1703.

26. In the MS: Mar. 1691-July 1700; Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 24, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691-Oct. 1710; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 139; Germanos begins Athanasios' tenure in July. Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 827.

27. In the MS: Mar. 1691-31 May 1696; Nos. 1, 11, 12. Inclusive dates: 1676-31 May 1696, resigned. See Nikolopoulos, *TEE*, XII, 134; Janin, (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 745) lists Gregorios' dates as 1696-1714. But these are Gennadios' dates who succeeded Gregorios. See below No. 12. Error probably due to printer.

28. Theodoretos had served from 1670-1674 and was deposed. Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VIII, 83-84; *idem*, *Mone Philosophou* (Athens, 1960), pp. 403-07; *idem*, *Theologia*, XX (1949), 335-44.

29. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1691 - Oct. 1702, resigned. During his tenure, his diocese was elevated to the rank of archdiocese (July 1694) and after his resignation was joined to the metropolis of Heraklia. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 114; Gritsopoulos, *Archeion*, XVIII, 192.

30. Canon 26 of the Council of Chalkedon required all sees to have an *oikonomos* (steward) to manage the financial affairs of the Church. For this office, see Konstantinos Ralles, "Peri tou ekklesiastikou axiomatos tou Oikonomou," *Praktika tes Akademias Athenon*, VII (1932), 4-10; Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 76.

31. This is Grand Logothetes Ioannes Karyophylles discussed above in n 1. He served as Grand Logothetes from 5 Dec. 1676-25 July 1691. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 132.

32. This is Alexander Mavrokordatos who followed Panagiotis Nikousios in the office of Grand Dragoman of the Ottoman Porte and Ioannes Karyophylles in the office of Grand Logothetes of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Alexander served the Church in other capacities as well and taught in the Patriarchal School for a number of years. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 24-26 and 130 for a brief biographical sketch. Newer studies are Gritsopoulos, *Patriarchike Megale tou Genous Schole* (Athens, 1966), pp. 231-47 and Nestor Camariano, *Alexander Mavrocordato, Le Grand Drogman* (Thessalonike, 1970).

33. Ralakes was a son of John Karyophylles. He served as

Grand Logothetes from 1 May 1687-25 Mar. 1691. Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 67-68 and 131.

34. Antonios Spantones was born in Constantinople in 1655 and died there in 1726. He was one of the outstanding teachers and directors of the Patriarchal School, also called the Great School of the Nation, the Patriarchal School, and the Patriarchal Academy.

In the MS: Spantones appears as Dikaiophylax in (Mar. 1691-Oct. 1698) Nos. 1 and 38, and as Protekdikos (12 Oct. 1699) in No. 51. His complete list of offices (according to Gritsopoulos) is as follows: Diermeneutes 1675-1687, Logothetes 1688, Dikaiophylax c 1690, Protekdikos 1696-1711, Grand Rhetor 1711-1717, and Grand Chartophylax 1717-Sept. 1726, died.

In light of my study (*Aspects*, p. 84), Spantones tenure as Grand Rhetor should begin at least as early as 10 Feb. 1705 when he confirms a promissory note of Voevode (Hospodar) of Wallachia John Antiochos, son of Constantin. The best treatment is by Gritsopoulos, *Patriarchike Megale tou Genous Schole* (Athens, 1966) I, 263-68, 282-84, 321-31. He is a bit confusing in his chronology but this is due to inconsistencies in the sources. See, too, *idem*, TEE, XI, 350-52 and Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 59, 70-71, 76, 78-79, 82, 84-86, 89, 91.

35. In the MS: Nos. 1, 42, 45, 51 where he appears in three different offices: Logothetes--Mar. 1691, Provestiarios (former) --1699, and Dikaiophylax--June 1699 and 12 Oct. 1699. Inclusive dates: Logothetes, 15 Mar. 1681-15 July 1691; Protovestiarios, 5 Apr. 1682-15 Oct. 1682; and Dikaiophylax, after July 1691-? See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 131-33.

36. Manouel was also a son of John Karyophylles. Inclusive dates: Jan. 1691-27 Oct. 1693. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

37. A leading Phanariot, related to the Rossetos family. *Ibid.*, p. 45.

38. Another Phanariot and the father-in-law of Nicholas Mavrokordatos, son of Alexander, and later Voevode of Moldavia and Wallachia. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, pp. 205-06.

39. See Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 197.

2 (5)
ELECTION

Ekloge
Patriarch Kallinikos II
March 1692, Indiction 15

The Protosynkelos of the Great Church Konstantios is elected Metropolitan of Rhodes¹ to succeed Parthenios who was transferred to Nikomedia.²

Other candidates: Archimandrites Makarios and Priest Kyrillos.

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia,³
†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia,⁴
†Nikodemos of Derkos,⁵ †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora.⁶

Cited: Athenagoras, **EEBS**, IX (1932), 260

1. In the MS: Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 2, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 39, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: Elected, Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702. Konstantinides, **TEE**, X, 820.

2. This is the same Parthenios who signs the document as Parthenios of Nikomedia. See below n 4. As Metropolitan of Rhodes, Parthenios served from 1676-c Mar. 1692; Konstantinides, **TEE**, X, 820.

3. In the MS: Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 75, 76, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: Apr. 1689-1711; Germanos, **Thrakika**, VI, 76. On 20 Oct. 1707, Neophytos was elected patriarch to succeed Gabriel III who died, but his election was invalidated because he was unacceptable to the Ottoman authorities. He remained in Heraklia until his death. Germanos (**Orthodoxia**, X (1935), 453) numbers him among the patriarchs of Constantinople.

4. In the MS: Mar. 1692-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60,

61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85. Inclusive dates: 1691-1712. Konstantinides, **TEE**, IX, 543.

5. In the MS: Mar. 1692-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87. Inclusive dates: Elected, Sept. 1688-sometime before Dec. 1731 when his successor Samouel was elected and he is cited as dead; Germanos, **Thrakika**, VI, 66-67; Vaporis, **Aspects**, p. 110, pp. 73-74, but cf. Janin (**Dictionnaire**, XIV, 316) whose dates are "1689-?"

6. In the MS: Mar. 1692-Jan. 1700; Nos. 2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 47, 54. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1692-1707; Germanos (**Thrakika**, VI, 59) has May 1692 as the earliest attestation.

3 (6)

CONFIRMATION

Epivevaioterion sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

June 1692, Indiction 15

The stavropegion rank of the monastery of St. John the Baptist and Forerunner, called **Tes Sketes**, in Verroia is confirmed. In the past, its rank had been confirmed by Patriarchs Dionysios III the Elder¹ and Kyrillos I.²

As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is required to pay two gold florins annually. Metropolitan [Ioasaph] of Verroia³ is admonished not to interfere in any way in the affairs of the monastery.

Cited: Gedeon, **Pinakes**, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 109; Aımilianos, p. 474.

1. Patriarch Dionysios III Vardales was born on the island of Andros to a distinguished and wealthy family. Drawn early to the

monastic life, he joined the monastery of Panachrantos on Andros. Later, he traveled to Constantinople where he became a member of the patriarchal staff, rising to the office of Grand Protosynkelos. In July 1652, he was elected Metropolitan of Larissa to succeed Paisios I who became Patriarch of Constantinople.

In 1659, while retaining his see, Dionysios was also appointed administrator of the Metropolis of Prousa, left vacant by the hanging of former Patriarch Gabriel II (1657) by the Turks. (Patriarch Gabriel had been elected administrator of Prousa after being expelled from his patriarchal office on 24 March 1657.)

Three years later, on 29 June 1662, Dionysios was elected patriarch to succeed Parthenios IV. Dionysios did not remain in office long; he was expelled on 21 October 1665 in favor of the same Parthenios IV who was to serve as patriarch five different times (1657-1685, intermittently).

As patriarch, Dionysios was active in his attempts to thwart the activities of the Jesuits and supported education by contributing to the reestablishment of the Patriarchal School. Concerned for the welfare of the entire Orthodox Church, Patriarch Dionysios, together with the other Orthodox Patriarchs, sent a tomos in 1663 to Moscow in which answers were given to various ecclesiastical questions troubling that church. Later, thinking it unwise to personally accept Tsar Alexis' invitation to go to Russia and arbitrate the controversy surrounding the person and activities of Patriarch Nikon, Dionysios sent Patriarchs Paisios of Alexandria (1657-1678) and Makarios of Antioch (1647-1685). The two patriarchs with others participated in the Synod of 1667 which unfortunately did not solve the controversy but led to the condemnation and schism of the Old Believers.

When he was expelled as patriarch, Dionysios was initially unwilling to accept his dethronement, but later he became reconciled with Patriarch Parthenios who elected him administrator of Thessalonike. Dionysios served in this capacity from April 1666 to the end of 1671 when he resigned. He left Thessalonike in 1669 to make a journey to Jerusalem.

After an unsuccessful attempt to become patriarch again, Dionysios retired to the monastery of Laura on Mount Athos where he remained until his death on 28 August 1696.

Patriarch Dionysios had inherited money from his father and brother. Much of this he gave to various philanthropies. He made a large gift to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and contributed

greatly to the repair and restoration of the monastery to which he retired. Despite his involvement in ecclesiastical politics, his reputation was that of an educated and saintly person.

The best biography is by P. A. Vitales, *Kykladikai Oikoumenikoi Patriarchai* (Athens, 1961), pp. 27-40 with bibliography and official documents. See, too, Meletios, *Historia*, p. 466; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 588-91; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX, (1934), 191-95; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, V, 22-23.

2. See above No. 1.

3. Perhaps Ioasaph of Verroia attested in 1686; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, III, 826; Janin (*Dictionnaire*, VIII, 887) cites an Ioakeim from 1649-1689, followed by Leontios in 1705.

4 (7)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II
August 1695, Indiction 3

Metropolitan Makarios of Klaudioupolis¹ is elected Metropolitan of Paronaxia² to succeed Ioasaph who resigned.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Neilos and Hieromonk Neophytos

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. Inclusive dates: unknown. Not cited by Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 1077-79) nor by *TEE* which has no entry for this see.

2. In the MS: Aug. - June 1699; Nos. 4, 32, 33, 44. Inclusive dates: Elected, Aug. 1695-1703; Sphyroeras, *TEE*, X, 89.

3. Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-c. Aug. 1695, resigned; Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 70; Sphyroeras, *TEE*, X, 89.

5 (7b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

September 1695, Indiction 4

Hieromonk and pneumatikos Iakovos is elected Metropolitan of Neokaisaria & Ineon¹ to succeed Ignatios who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Christophoros and Hieromonk Philaretos

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia. †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos

1. In the MS: Sept. 1695-19 Dec. 1696; Nos. 5, 17, 20. Inclusive dates: Elected, Sept. 1695-19 Dec. 1696, resigned. Attested on 17 Dec. 1697 as former when his successor Gregorios was elected. See below No. 20.

2. Inclusive dates: ?-about Sept. 1695; Alexoudes, (*Leukoma*, p. 185) does not cite Ignatios but only Iakovos in 1713.

6 (8-9)

GRANT OF STAVROPEGION RANK

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

February 1696, Indiction 4

The Monastery of Hagia Zone of the Theotokos, at the place called Damari¹ in the village of Vathy, on the island of Samos, is granted stavropegion rank. As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is required to contribute 30 okades of honey annually.

The original church had been torn down. Hieromonk Meletios, now **hegoumenos** of the monastery, rebuilt the church and founded the monastery with the assistance of local Christians. These facts, contained in the petition to the Patriarchate, were verified in writing by Metropolitan Gedeon of Samos² and his clergy.

Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon, **Pinakes**, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 109; Aımilianos, p. 474.

1. Also cited as Vlamari in the text.

2. In the MS: Feb. 1696-Jan. 1700?; Konstantinides, **TEE**, X, 1144. Also see below No. 55.

7 (9b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

March 1696, Indiction 4

Metropolitan Gennadios, formerly of Drystra¹ is elected Metropolitan of Nikaia² to succeed Ioannikios who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Anthimos and Priest Laurentios

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia. †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa,⁴ †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene,⁵ †Athanasios of Drystra

1. Also attested in 1682. Inclusive dates: 1682-sometime before Feb. 1687. Germanos (**Thrakika**, VIII, 139) erroneously has Gennadios elected Metropolitan of Neokaisaria, although citing

the above document. Janin (*Dictionnaire*. XIV, 827) cites Gennadios in 1683 only.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, Mar. 1696-1712. Konstantinides (TEE, IX, 459) following Alexoudes lists Gennadios only in 1712.

3. Inclusive dates: ?-c. Mar. 1696 when cited as dead. He is unknown to Konstantinides and to Alexoudes, *Leukoma*.

4. In the MS: Mar. 1696-June 1701; Nos. 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 47, 73, 75, 76. Inclusive dates: 1689-1720; Phoropoulos, TEE, X, 679; Alexoudes, *Leukoma*, p. 185.

5. In the MS: Mar. 1696-Aug. 1701; Nos. 7, 8, 9, 73, 75, 76. 79. Inclusive dates: Mar. 1696-Aug. 1701. Unknown to Konstantinides (TEE, IX, 272) who lists no one between 1672-1712.

8 (10)

DEPOSITION AND UNFROCKING

Synodike kathairesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

[1/2] April 1696, Indiction 4

Metropolitan Methodios of Thessalonike¹ is deposed, unfrocked, and anathematized because he employed "satanic methods," oppressed officials, clergy, and laymen, and exercised an unholy and worthless administration. Consequently, permission is given to the Holy Synod to elect another in his place.

Using the civil authority,² Methodios had the nun Zenovia exiled because of alleged bad conduct. But he did this in order to seize her possessions. Later, when she returned and sought to recover her things, Methodios was able to have her exiled again. Then he set a snare for her and, "using Jews," he had her strangled and thrown into the sea. Her body, however, was washed ashore. Consequently, this "good" hierarch was apprehended by the civil authorities, who demanded that he produce

her. When he could not, he was put into chains, incarcerated, and tortured. Meanwhile, the Christians of his metropolis turned from him and asked the Patriarchate for his official condemnation and the election of a new hierarch.

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Parthenios of Larissa,³ †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Neophytos of Karpathos.⁴

Monokondylion Menologema

Text: Gedeon, "Thessalonikeon palaiai koinotikai dienexeis," *Makedonika*, II, (1941-52), 3-5, but without signatures. Gedeon copied the text from the MS of Kritias, p. 570. There the document, according to him, is dated February 1696, Indiction 4. The above April dating, however, is very legible in the text.

1. In the MS: 1/2 Apr. 1696-May 1697; Nos. 8, 9, 24. Inclusive dates: 1687-1/2 Apr. 1696, deposed. See Mystakides, *EEBS*, XII (1936), 176 and Tsogas, *TEE*, VI, 461. Note No. 4 in Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 73 should be modified in light of this document and No. 9 below.

This was not the end of Methodios' career. He was "forgiven" not only by the Synod but somehow avoided being punished by the Ottomans. Thus, he was able to carry on in a rather unorthodox fashion. See below No. 24 for more of Methodios' activities.

2. Reference to the Ottoman authorities.

3. In the MS: 1/2 Apr. 1696-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 8, 9, 86, 87. Inclusive dates: 1688-28 Mar. 1719; Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, VIII, 131) has Parthenios from 1688-1713 and Meletios in 1721.

4. In the MS: 1/2 Apr. - June 1696; Nos. 8, 9, 12, 13, 15. Inclusive dates: 1680-1723. See Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VI, 386; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XI, 1111-12.

9 (11)
ELECTION

Ekloge
Patriarch Kallinikos II
2 April 1696, Indiction 4

Hieromonk Ignatios is elected Metropolitan of Thessalonike¹ to succeed the "Evil-Methodios" who was deposed and unfrocked.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Anthimos and Hieromonk Laurentios

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Parthenios of Larissa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Daniel of Mitylene, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Gregorios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Neophytos of Karpathos

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 133.

1. In the MS: 2 Apr. 1696-17 Feb. 1699; Nos. 8, 9, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40. Inclusive dates: Elected, 2 Apr. 1696-1712; Gedeon *Ephemerides*, p. 133, but see Tzogas (TEE, VI, 461) where the dates are erroneously listed as 1698-1712.

2. See above No. 8.

10 (14)

RESIGNATION

Paraitiesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II
3 April 1696, Indiction 4

Archbishop Makarios of Tzia & Thermia¹ resigns from his see because of ill health in favor of Metropolitan Ioasaph, formerly of Amykla² "in the Peloponessos." Makarios plans to enter a monastery and "entreats" Patriarch [Kallinikos] to elect Ioasaph in his place.

†the humble Archbishop Makarios, formerly of Tzia & Thermia

Witnessed by: †Oikonomos George the priest, who worships your All-Holiness, †Sakellarios Manouel the priest, who worships your All-Holiness, †the Skevo-phylax of Thermia, †the Chartophylax of Thermia, †the Sakkelliou of Thermia, †Protonotarios Panagiotes of Thermia.

1. In the MS: 3 Apr. - June 1696; Nos. 10, 16. Inclusive dates: ? - 3 Apr. 1696, resigned. A. Panotes (TEE, XI, 745-50) does not list a Makarios in the seventeenth century, nor does Laurent (Dictionnaire, XIII, 1190-91).

2. In No. 16 below, dated June 1696, that is, two months following the resignation above, the archdiocese of Tzia & Thermia is filled by the election of Vartholomaïos (Bartholomew). This probably means that Makarios' recommendation was not accepted because Vartholomaïos is recorded as succeeding Makarios and not Ioasaph. Gritsopoulos (TEE, II, 397-400) does not know of Ioasaph of Amykla nor does Vailhé in Dictionnaire, II, 1377.

11 (12)

RESIGNATION

Paraitiesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

31 May 1696, Indiction 4

Metropolitan Gregorios of Chios resigns from his metropolis because "certain circumstances" prohibit him from continuing to administer it. Patriarch Kallinikos "has permission" to elect another in his place.

†Metropolitan Gregorios, formerly of Chios¹

1. See above No. 1, n 27.

12 (12b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

31 May 1696, Indiction 4

Hieromonk Gennadios is elected Metropolitan of Chios¹ to succeed Gregorios who resigned.

Other candidates: Hieromonk Pankratios and Hieromonk Neilos

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora, †Neophytos of Karpathos

1. In the MS: 31 May 1696-16 Dec. 1701; Nos. 12, 16, 34, 50, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81. Inclusive dates: Elected, 31 May 1696-25 Feb. 1714, transferred to Heraklia where he served until his death on 19 Oct. 1718. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI (1937), 76; Konstantinos Amantos, "Apo ten Ekklesiastiken historian tes Chiou," *Hellenika*, IV (1931), 56; Phoropoulos, *TEE*, IV, 290; Nikolopoulos, *TEE*, XII, 134; Mystakides, *EEBS*, XII (1936), 233; Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XII, 744-46) does not know the date of Gennadios' election.

13 (11b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II
June 1696, Indiction 4

Hieromonk Neophytos is elected Metropolitan of Sevestia¹ which had remained without a hierarch for "many years."²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Neilos and Hieromonk Makarios.

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora, †Neophytos of Karpathos.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1696-?

2. The phrase "many years" cannot be taken literally, for in July 1617 Serapheim was elected Metropolitan of Sevestia and the phrase is repeated there. It is also repeated in May 1629 when Ioseph was elected to the same metropolis. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, pp. 97-98 and Sathas, pp. 560, 567.

14 (13)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II
2 June 1696, Indiction 4

Metropolitan Ioasaph of Amasia resigns because his illness makes him unable to administer his metropolis. Moreover, he wishes to prepare in quiet for the future judgment awaiting him from God.

†Metropolitan Ioasaph, formerly of Amasia¹

1. In the MS: June 1696; Nos. 14, 15. Inclusive dates: Unknown. Gritsopoulos (TEE, II, 265) following Alexoudes (Leukoma, p. 184), lists Ioasaph - 1668-1671; followed by Gerasimos in 1672 and Dionysios 1717-1720. See Mystakides, EEBS, XII (1936), 157; Vailhé (Dictionnaire, II, 969) lists Ioasaph by name only. I suspect this is a different Ioasaph than the one listed from 1668-1671.

15 (13b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II
June 1696, Indiction 4

Hieromonk Ioannikios is elected Metropolitan of Amasia¹ to succeed Ioasaph who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Makarios and Hieromonk Philaretos

†Theophanes of Ephesos, †Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora, †Neophytos of Karpathos

1. In the MS: June 1696-sometime before 7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 15, 16, 86. Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1696-sometime before 7 Aug. 1702 when his successor Dionysios was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 85. Ioannikios is unknown to Gritsopoulos (TEE, II, 265) and is cited by name only by Vailhé, (Dictionnaire, II, 969).

2. See above No. 14.

16 (14b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

June 1696, Indiction 4

Hieromonk Vartholomaïos (Bartholomew) is elected Archbishop of Tzia & Thermia¹ to succeed Makarios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Germanos and Hieromonk Makarios

†Theóphanes of Ephesos, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Athanasios of Drystra, †Ioannikios of Amasia, †Gennadios of Chios, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, June 1696-? Panotes (TEE, XI, 748) cites Vartholomaïos but without a date while Laurent (Dictionnaire, XIII, 1190-91) places him about 1730.

2. See above No. 10, n 1 and 2.

17 (16b)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

19 December 1696, Indiction 5

Metropolitan Iakovos of Neokaisaria & Ineon resigns from his metropolis because "circumstances" make it impossible for him to continue to administer it. Patriarch Kallinikos II is "given permission" to elect another in his place.

†Metropolitan Iakovos, formerly of Neokaisaria & Ineon¹

1. See above No. 5, n 1.

18 (15)

DEPOSITION AND UNFROCKING

Kathairesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

January 1697, Indiction 5

Archbishop Philotheos of Elasson [& Domenikon]¹ is deposed and unfrocked for impiety, un-Christian conduct toward his flock, various "evil crimes," and for disobedience to the Great Church. Moreover, he refused to fulfill his annual financial obligations to the Patriarchate as required by the synodical tomos.²

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Leontios of Pisidia,³ †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora

Monokondylion. Menologema.

1. In the MS: Jan. 1697; Nos. 18, 19. Inclusive dates: 1695-Jan. 1697, deposed. Janin (*Dictionnaire*, XV, 114) dates Philotheos' deposition in 1696 as does Konstantinides (*TEE*, V, 547) who follows him.

2. There were a number of synodical *tomoi* (acts) promulgated in the first part of the seventeenth century to which this may refer. The oldest was a *tomos* issued by Patriarch Neophytos in April 1604 (text: *Hypselantes*, pp. 121-22), followed by five others: one by Patriarch Raphael II in 1603, one by Patriarch Kyrillos I in July 1624 (text: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analekta*, IV, 95-97, followed by three under Patriarch Parthenios I, May 1641 (text: *Delikanes*, III, 288-302), September 1641 (text: *ibid.*, 309-11), and January 1643 (text: *ibid.*, 314-21). All called for the expulsion of those hierarchs who would not or could not fulfill their financial obligations to the Patriarchate.

In addition, there were other patriarchal documents: one was issued by Kyrillos I on December 1620 (text: Legrand, IV, 342-45; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 471-75 and *Delikanes*, III, 321-25) which called for the same penalty.

The frequent patriarchal changes in the first forty years of the seventeenth century, involving Kyrillos I-seven times, Kyrillos II-three times, Neophytos II-two times, Matthaios II, Raphael II, Timotheos II, Anthimos II, Neophytos III, and Parthenios I-all one time each, plus the illegal seizure of the patriarchal throne by Gregory IV of Amasia and Athanasios III Patelarios, all contributed to the creation of an enormous debt for which the Patriarchate had to assume responsibility.

The efforts of John Basil, Voevode of Moldavia, to free the Patriarchate of its debts by assuming their payment in May 1641 proved to be a short lived solution. The same fate befell the financial committee which he insisted on establishing in Constantinople to oversee the financial affairs of the Patriarchate. Shortly afterwards, the new patriarchal debt was as high as ever. See Runciman, *Great Church*, pp. 341-42; Arampatzoglou, *Photieios*, I, 16-23.

3. In the MS: Jan. 1697-28 Mar. 1719; Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 87. Inclusive dates: Jan. 1697-sometime before 28 Mar. 1719 when his successor Kosmas, formerly of Siphnos, was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 87 and Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 239.

19 (16)
ELECTION

Ekloge
Patriarch Kallinikos II
16 January 1697, Indiction 5

Bishop Zacharias formerly of Petra¹ [Krete] is elected Archbishop of Elasson & Domenikon² to succeed Philotheos who was deposed.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Leontios and Hieromonk Neophytos

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Leontios of Pisidia, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 133.

1. Inclusive dates: ? - 16 Jan. 1697, transferred to Elasson & Domenikon. See Gedeon, *ibid*.

2. In the MS: 16: 16 Jan. 1697 - sometime before Mar. 1699 when Zosimas, formerly of Achrida, became *proedros* of Elasson & Domenikon. See below 41. Inclusive dates: Elected, 16 Jan. 1697 - Mar. 1699. N. Tomadakes, "Elegchos ton en Krete archierateusanton epi Tourkokratias 1648-1898," *EEKS*, III (1940), 151. Tomadakes knows of this election but adds nothing further concerning Zacharias whose predecessors Raphael and Athanasios are listed by name only. Gedeon (*Ephemerides*, p. 133) places Petra in Thessaly; it should be Krete. Also see Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XV, 115.

3. See above No. 18.

20 (17)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

17 January 1697, Indiction 5

Hieromonk Gregorios is elected Metropolitan of Neokaisaria & Ineon¹ to succeed Iakovos, the former metropolitan, who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Parthenios and Hieromonk Philaretos

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Leontios of Pisidia, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, Jan. 1697-?. He is unknown to Alexoudes, *Leukoma*.

2. See above No. 5.

21 (18)

DEPOSITION AND UNFROCKING

Kathairesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

February 1697, Indiction 5

Metropolitan Meletios of Naupaktos & Arta¹ is deposed, unfrocked, and anathematized for “being ungrateful to the Great Church of Christ, his spiritual mother and benefactor.” He refused to pay his annual *zetia*, *voetheia*, and imperial *charatsi* (*kharadj*).

After ignoring written appeals to pay, Meletios was suspended in accordance with the provisions of the synodical *tomos*.² However, he ignored the suspension and was consequently deposed. Ignoring this too, Meletios abandoned his metropolis “without permission.”

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Klemes of Ioannina,³ Leontios of Pisidia, †Kallinikos of Krete,⁴ Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylon. Menologema.

Cited: Germanos, ECH, XII, 14

1. In the MS: Feb. 1697; Nos. 21, 22. Inclusive dates: Elected, Nov. 1691-Feb. 1697, deposed. *Ibid.*; Christopoulos, TEE, IX, 323-28.

Spyridon G. Makres (TEE, VIII, 956-58) writes a short biography of this famous bishop based on Meletios' own writings. According to this account, Meletios served peacefully in his metropolis until 1696 when a disturbance occurred and he was implicated. The Patriarchate of Constantinople, compelled by the Ottoman authorities, deposed Meletios who fled to Ioannina in

Epiros and hid there for two months. He then returned to Arta, which had come under Venetian occupation in the meantime, and remained there for three years.

This account of Meletios' deposition does not obviously resemble the account above furnished by the official patriarchal document. In any event, it appears that Meletios, who was born in Ioannina in 1661 and was ordained Metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta at the young age of thirty, was forgiven. In 1701, he was sent to the Peloponnesos as patriarchal exarch to collect monies owed to the Patriarchate. In October 1703, he was elected Metropolitan of Athens. The Athenians had become unhappy with their Metropolitan Kyrillos (1693-1703) and had asked for Meletios as his replacement. The romance, however, did not last long, for in 1713 they asked for Meletios' ouster.

Ignorant perhaps of the events in Athens, the Christians of Ioannina asked for Meletios by name when their Metropolitan Klemes (1680-1714) died. Meletios was actually elected by Patriarch Kosmas III (1714-1716) to fill the vacancy at Ioannina, but Meletios delayed--due to illness--in going there. Because of this, Bishop Hierotheos of Euripos was elected and transferred to Ioannina. Meletios later went on to Constantinople where he died on 12 December 1714.

Meletios, who had studied in Venice and Padua, has earned a place in Greek Orthodox ecclesiastical historiography because he was the first to write a history of the Church in modern times. Germanos, *ECH*, XII, 68; Anastasiou, *TEE*, VII, 68.

2. See above No. 18.

3. In the MS: Feb. - 5 July 1697; Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24, 26. Inclusive dates: 1680-1715; Germanos, *ECH*, XII, 68; Anastasiou, *TEE*, VII, 68; Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 58.

4. In the MS: Feb. 1697-6 Aug. 1699; Nos. 21, 22, 23, 47. Inclusive dates: Feb. 1697-1699, retired. Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIII, 1036; T. Tzedakes, *TEE*, VII, 1030; Tomadakes, *EEKS*, II, 121.

22 (19)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

19 February 1697, Indiction 5

Archbishop Makarios of Metra & Athyra¹ is elected Metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta² to succeed Meletios who was deposed.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Philotheos and Hieromonk Leontios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Klemes of Ioannina, †Leontios of Pisidia, †Kallinikos of Krete, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Germanos, ECH, XII, 14; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 134

1. In the MS: Nos. 22, 25. Inclusive dates: Elected, 26 May 1695-19 Feb. 1697. When his election to Naupaktos & Arta was invalidated, Makarios retained his former title until his election to Anchialos on 28 Apr. 1700; see below No. 60; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 93, n 2; Gritsopoulos, TEE, IX, 328; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 134. Gedeon notes that Makarios' election as Archbishop of Metra & Athyra took place on Sunday and was performed by one active hierarch and three without sees: Neophytos of Heraklia, Germanos, formerly of Kaisaria, Ignatios, formerly of Samos, and Gedeon, formerly of Metra & Athyra. At the time of this election, Makarios was protosynkelos of the metropolis of Nikomedia; *ibid.*

2. In the MS: 19 Feb.-July 1697; Nos. 22, 25, 26. Inclusive dates: Elected, 19 Feb. 1697-5 July 1697, resigned. Germanos, ECH, XII, 14. Of course, since Makarios' election was invalidated, his nearly five month tenure as metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta officially does not exist. See below No. 59.

3. See above No. 21. n 1.

23 (19b)
ELECTION

Ekloge
Patriarch Kallinikos II
19 February 1697, Indiction 5

Hieromonk Neilos is elected Archbishop of Metra & Athyra¹ to succeed Makarios who was transferred to Naupaktos & Arta.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Parthenios and Hieromonk Dionysios

†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Klemes of Ioannina, †Leontios of Pisidia, †Kallinikos of Krete, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 134.

1. In the MS: 19 Feb. 1697-15 June 1698; Nos. 23, 30. Inclusive dates: Elected, 19 Feb. 1697-sometime before 20 May 1711 when his successor Metrophanes (20 May 1711-May 1723) was elected; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 93; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 134.

2. See above No. 22, n 2.

24 (20)

PATRIARCHAL DECLARATION

Synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

May 1697, Indiction 5

Patriarch Kallinikos II, joined by Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem and hierarchs, officials, and archons meet in Adrianople¹ and declare that the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, together with the Archbishoprics of Cyprus, Achrida (Ohrid), and Pekion (Peć) are autonomous and independent churches.² Nevertheless, they had been called upon to render financial assistance to the Great Church of Christ.

This assistance was needed to pay off the large sum of money borrowed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople --which will bear the greatest part of the cost--in order to avert a great danger to the entire Church caused by "certain disciples of the devil" not named out of embarrassment.³

These evil ones had proposed to the [Ottoman] government that it sell to them the ecclesiastical offices of the Church in the same manner that land was farmed out (the words used in the text are: *mukataa* and *malikâne*). They in turn would offer the offices to the highest bidder. Therefore, an appeal was made to the government, money was spent, and thus common destruction was avoided.

All those who assist or in any way participate in this "satanic conspiracy" are excommunicated and anathematized.

The Synod further declares that the assistance to be given the Ecumenical Patriarchate should in no way set

a precedence for the future and it is in witness of this fact that this synodical and patriarchal ruling is placed in the hands of Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem.

†Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Theodosios of Tornovo,⁴ †Athanasios of Adrianople,⁵ †Neophytos of Philip-popolis,⁶ †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Klimes of Ioannina, †Hieremias of Didymoteichon,⁷ †Daniel of Anchialos,⁸ †Athanasios of Drystra, †Kallinikos of Maronia.⁹

Monokondy lion

Text: Delikanes (II, 449-52) omits the last two signatories. Gedeon (Diataxeis, I, 64-67) omits all signatories; Mazarakes (Symvole, 541-43) omits the last three signatories and Konstantios of Rhodes. He also lists Iakovos of Tornovo and Hieremias of Ioannina. See Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 180 and Anastasiou, *TEE*, VII, 68.

1. The synod met in Adrianople because the court of Sultan Mustapha II (1695-1703) was in residence there.

2. The Church of Cyprus owed its independence, maintained throughout its history, to the First Ecumenical Council of Nikaia in 325.

Peć (Pekion), the seat of the Serbian Church, was separated by the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Ohrid (Achrida) in 1219 and was made into an autocephalous archbishopric under Archbishop Savas, later the patron saint of the Serbian nation. In 1345, Stephen Dusan proclaimed himself emperor of the Serbs and Greeks. He naturally also raised the rank of his archbishop to that of patriarch. This change was reluctantly recognized by Constantinople in 1375. Under the Ottomans, patriarchal status was initially lost but not independence. Later, through the efforts of Mehmed Sokolovic (Sökülü), who later became Grand Vizier under Süleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566) and whose brother Makarios was the Serbian archbishop, the Serbian Church once again became a patriarchate. However, this status was not truly recognized as the above document indicates. Constantinople

looked upon Peć as an independent archbishopric.

Ohrid became a patriarchate due to the military successes of the Bulgarian state under Samuel in 976 and was abolished in 1018 when Bulgaria was conquered by Basil II of Byzantium. Nevertheless, its independent status was maintained by the Byzantines.

Although the Bulgarians regained patriarchal status in 1235 with the revival of the Bulgarian state under Asen II (1218-1241), its seat was in Tirnovo. The latter lost its patriarchal rank and independence with the Ottoman conquest and became a metropolis of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Ohrid, however, continued on its independent status until 1767 when due to financial difficulties and the dangers of apostasy to Islam it petitioned to become a metropolis of Constantinople. Peć did the same in the previous year. Official documents in Delikanes, III, pp. 898-900, 921-23.

3. The leader of the "disciples of the devil" was Metropolitan Methodios of Thessalonike, who was deposed and unfrocked for using "satanic methods" in his metropolis (see above No. 8). He apparently carried over these methods into his subsequent activities after failing to regain his former metropolis. It is he who proposed to the Grand Vizier (out of revenge?) that the right of electing hierarchs be taken away from the Patriarch and the Holy Synod and be reserved for the Ottoman state which would farm them out. Then they would be sold to the highest bidder. The Patriarch and the Holy Synod would simply be required to ordain the successful candidates in the bidding.

Realizing, of course, that this scheme would have transgressed one of the basic rights of the Patriarchate, held since 1453, and the chaos that would have followed, the Ottomans allowed themselves to be richly bribed to refrain from implementing the scheme. This explains both the debt incurred by the Patriarchate and the call for assistance to all Orthodox Churches within the Ottoman Empire.

Subsequent to these events, it appears that Methodios was "forgiven" and was even entrusted with an important mission. He later traveled to Russia where he appealed in person to Peter the Great to come to the assistance of the Orthodox under the Turks. See Meletios, *Historia*, p. 485; Philaretos Vapheides, *Ekklesiastike*

historia . . . Nea Ekklesiastike historia, 1453-1908 (Constantinople, 1912), III, part 1, 24; M. Gedeon, "Thessalonikeon palaiai koinoitikai dienexeis," *Makedonika*, II (1941-1952), pp. 5-6.

4. Before his election to Tornovo, Theodosios was Bishop of Lititza (Litica), elected on 7 Feb. 1652. In this office he is attested as late as 15 Mar. 1681. See Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 149 and Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 43. As metropolitan of Tornovo, the above is his only attestation: Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 180; Alexoudes, *Leukoma*, p. 183.

5. In the MS: May 1697-1701; Nos. 24, 39, 77. Inclusive dates: Elected, 1692-July 1709, elected Patriarch of Constantinople as Athanasios V. Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, X, 457-58; Idem, *Thrakika*, VI, 42; Alexoudes, *Leukoma*, p. 184.

Athanasios was a distinguished patriarch who was born in Krete and studied in Halle, Germany. He was elected Metropolitan of Tornovo on 15 March 1689 and served there until 1692 when he was transferred to Adrianople from where he was elected head of the Church of Constantinople.

Athanasios was one of the hierarchs who had accompanied Patriarch-elect Kyrillos of Kyzikos to acquire state confirmation. Kyrillos, however, was rejected by Mustapha II whose son-in-law Ali Pasha Tzorlolu chose Athanasios instead. Athanasios served until December 1711 when he was deposed, following Tzorlolu's own expulsion, by the Holy Synod because of his irregular election. In his place they elected their original choice, Kyrillos of Kyzikos.

Athanasios remained in Constantinople following his expulsion until 1718 when he traveled to Jassy, Moldavia where he died.

6. In the MS: May 1697-Jan. 1701; Nos. 24, 28, 29, 65. Inclusive dates: Elected, 7 Jan. 1689-8 Apr. 1711, resigned. Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 186. Neophytos was a very well educated hierarch who traveled in Western Europe. For the details of his life, see Arampatzoglou, *Photieios*, I, 171-73.

7. Inclusive dates: Oct. 1692-May 1697; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 71.

8. In the MS: May 1697-28 Apr. 1700; Nos. 24, 30, 33, 60. Inclusive dates: Feb. 1687-13 Apr. 1700, cited as dead. Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 137; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VIII, 121. Vailhé (*Dictionnaire*, XI, 1513) lists Daniel from 1672-1697 with an interruption by Parthenios IV, former Patriarch of Constantinople on 17 Dec. 1676. Germanos (*Thrakika*, VIII, 121) attests Daniel

in Dec. 1671 and Parthenios from Jan. 1677-perhaps 1684. The latter is followed by Daniel (Germanos is not certain whether or not this is the same person) from Feb. 1687-28 Apr. 1700 when he is cited as dead. I have assumed that there were two Daniels because of the duration of the interruption by Patriarch Parthenios.

9. In the MS: May 1697-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 24, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: 1696-1714; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 87, Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VIII, 805.

25 (21)

RESIGNATION

Paraitesis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

July 1697, Indiction 5

Metropolitan Makarios of [Naupauktos &] Arta,¹ formerly of Metra & Athyra, resigns from his see because of financial difficulties. Moreover, before he could go to his see to assume his duties, some people in Arta objected to his election and appealed to the civil government to prevent his arrival. Not wishing to disturb the peace, Makarios did not press the matter. Nevertheless, his election cost him 1,000 *grosia* in expenses,² a sum advanced by the Great Church.

†Metropolitan Makarios, formerly of Naupaktos & Arta

Cited: Germanos, *ECH*, XII, 14; Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 134.

1. See above No. 22, n 1 and 2.

2. That is, for the purchase of his *berat*, the official diploma issued by the Ottoman government without which an hierarch could not officially assume office and begin to exercise his episcopal responsibilities. The sum probably included payment for interest on the debt of the metropolis as well.

26 (21b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

5 July 1697, Indiction 5

Hieromonk Gregorios is elected Metropolitan of Naupaktos & Arta¹ to succeed Makarios who resigned.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Parthenios and Hieromonk Dometios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Konstantios of Rhodes, †Gregorios of Smyrna,³ †Klemes of Ioannina, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Philaretos of Thebes,⁴ †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora

Cited: Germanos, ECH, XII, 14.

1. Inclusive dates: Elected, 5 July 1697-Oct. 1703 when his successor Neophytos, formerly of Santorine, succeeded him; Gritsopoulos, TEE, IX, 328.

2. See above No. 22.

3. In the MS: 5 July 1697-15 June 1698; Nos. 26, 30, 49. Inclusive dates: 1689-sometime before 15 June 1698 when his successor Kyprianos was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 49 for an account of his death.

Metropolitan Gregorios Kontares of Smyrna was born in the city of Servia and was ordained priest in 1675. As metropolitan, Gregorios rebuilt the cathedral church of St. Photeine and other ecclesiastical edifices in his province.

An educated man, Gregorios collected books which he willed to his metropolis. These later became the nucleus of the library of the famous Evangelical School of Smyrna. He was also noted for his acts of charity, especially for the ransoming of Christian slaves from Ottoman captivity.

Nevertheless, Gregorios had difficulties with some monks in his jurisdiction. Once on 20 July 1691 with archimandrites Kyrillos which was amicably settled, and another time with hieromonk

Nektarios on April 1698 when he actually came to blows. (See below No. 49). Shortly after this incident, he died from a stroke. See Chrestos Solomonides, *He Ekklesia tes Smyrnes* (Athens, 1960), 168-71; Gritsopoulos and M. Chairete, *TEE*, XI, 252.

4. In the MS: 5 July 1697-28 Aug. 1698; Nos. 26, 33, 36. Inclusive dates: 5 July 1697-28 Aug. 1698. He is unknown to Konstantinides (*TEE*, VI, 515).

27 (22)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

27 September 1697, Indiction 6

Hieromonk Galaktion is elected Metropolitan of Lemnos¹ to succeed Parthenios who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Neophytos and Hieromonk Dionysios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kallinikos of Kyzikos,
†Parthenios of Nikomedia, † . . . of . . . ,
†Neophytos of Philippoupolis, †Neophytos of Gothia.³

Text: Ateses, *Lemnos*, p. 34.

1. In the MS: 27 Sept. 1697-28 Aug. 1698; Nos. 27, 36. Inclusive dates: Elected, 27 Sept. 1697-sometime before 28 Aug. 1698 when his successor Makarios was elected and he is cited as dead. See below No. 36. Ateses cites Galaktion only in 1697; *Lemnos*, pp. 34-35, and in *TEE*, VII, 287.

2. Inclusive dates: ? - about 27 Sept. 1697; Ateses, *TEE*, VIII, 287.

3. In the MS: 27 Sept. 1697-28 Aug. 1698; Nos. 27, 28, 30, 36. Inclusive dates: 27 Sept. 1697-28 Aug. 1698. He is unknown to JANIN, *Dictionnaire*, XI, 158.

28 (22b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

26 November 1697, Indiction 6

Hieromonk Neophytos [Mavrommates] the Archimandrites is elected Archbishop of Santorine¹ to succeed Gedeon who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Dionysios and Hieromonk Nektarios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Neophytos of Philippoupolis, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Neophytos of Gothia

1. In the MS: 26 Nov. 1697-25 Apr. 1700; Nos. 28, 56, 57. Inclusive dates: Elected, 26 Nov. 1697-25 Apr. 1700, resigned. Konstantinides (TEE, VI, 518) does not know Neophytos' election or resignation. He lists "Parthenios 1653-1667?," followed by "Neophytos 1667?-1669?" and Zacharias 1699-1749. Gedeon (Ephemerides, pp. 134-35) informs us that Neophytos Mavrommates was ordained bishop on 30 Nov. 1697.

2. Inclusive dates: Unknown. He is unknown to Konstantinides (TEE, VI, 518).

29 (17b)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

January 1698, Indiction 6

The hegoumenos of the monastery of St. Loukas Steriotes¹ is informed that Priest Nicholas has committed no sin and may continue in his priestly duties

free from all interference. Anyone who acts contrary, is deposed if a clergyman and excommunicated if a layman.

Priest Nicholas had gone to the *hegoumenos* to ask for a solution to a canonical problem. Unable, however, to give a solution, the latter referred the question to the Patriarchate.

The Patriarchate and the Holy Synod were asked to rule on whether or not Priest Nicholas was guilty of any wrong doing when, in his absence, his wife became the God-mother of a child, through baptism, of a family for whose first child he stood as God-father. Some of the faithful believed this to be wrong and demanded that Priest Nicholas divorce his wife for her action.

Patriarch Kallinikos and the Synod ruled, in addition to Priest Nicholas' innocence, that there was nothing wrong with his wife's action. Many husbands and wives baptize children of the same family.²

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Neophytos of Philippoupolis, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Neophytos of Gothia

Monokondylion

Text: Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 87-89. Gedeon does not cite the specific codex. Cited: Karapiperes, p. 107. He erroneously dates the document 1697.

1. Also known as Hosios Loukas, one of the fine examples of eleventh century Byzantine architecture with brilliant mosaics. See Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, VIII, 380-90.

2. In July 1796, Patriarch Gerasimos III (1794-1797) and the Holy Synod ruled, citing canons that do not appear relevant, that clergymen and monks were prohibited from becoming God-parents. See Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 295-300.

30 (23)
ELECTION

Ekloge
Patriarch Kallinikos II
15 June 1698, Indiction 6

“The Most-learned” Hieromonk and Protosynkelos Kyprianos is elected Metropolitan of Smyrna¹ to succeed Gregorios who died.²

Other candidates: Hieromonk Makarios and Hieromonk Laurentios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Daniel of Anchialos, †Ioakeim of Ankyra,³ Neilos of Metra & Athyra, †Neophytos of Gothia

Cited: Athenagoras, **EEBS**, IX, 260-61.

1. In the MS: 15 June 1698-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 30, 33, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: Elected, 15 June 1698-14 Oct. 1707, died. Gritsopoulos and M. Charaite, **TEE**, XI, 253; Solomonides, *Smyrna*, p. 171.

2. See above No. 26.

3. In the MS: 15 June 1698-17 Feb. 1699; Nos. 30, 33, 36, 38, 40. Inclusive dates: Same. Gritsopoulos (**TEE**, I, 283) only notes 1698, while he is unknown to C. Karalevsky (**Dictionnaire**, II, 1538-43). Mystakides (**NP**, II (1920), 144) cites Ioakeim in 1698.

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchike kai synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1698, Indiction 6

The officials, clergy, and archons of the Metropolis of Verroia are instructed to make certain that the problem of Manouel Bogasinitzes and that of his brother are solved in a "Christian manner" and that they receive "justice."

The problem had its origin with Metropolitan Makarios, *Proedros* of Verroia.¹ He is said to have acted without conscience and proved insensitive because he ignored his financial obligations to the Great Church. Consequently, he was suspended and deposed.

In addition, Makarios had, according to Manouel Bogasinitzes who appeared in person before the Holy Synod, borrowed through him 900 grosia which his brother had guaranteed. When it came time to pay, not only did Makarios refuse, but he acted in a very ungrateful manner. More than that, he attempted fraud by trying to change the figures on the promissory note. The lenders, anxious for their money, threatened to have Manouel's brother imprisoned.

The above addressees are instructed to "awaken" Metropolitan Makarios "from his deep sleep."

Monokondylion

1. Inclusive dates: unknown. He is unknown to Gritsopoulos (TEE, III, 826) and Janin (*Dictionnaire*, VIII, 885-87). The former lists no one between "?Ioasaph 1686 and Leontios 1705," while Janin lists "Ioakeim 1649-1689 and Leontios 1705."

32 (24b)

A FALSE BISHOP

Patriarchike kai synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1698, Indiction 6

Metropolitan [Makarios] of Paronaxia,¹ the archbishops of "the islands in the White Sea" [Aegean], the officials, clergy, and the faithful are informed to be on their guard against Hieromonk "Evil-Kosmas Kalonas," who is parading about as "Bishop of Polyphengos."² He is a "wolf" who has been unfrocked and anathematized by the Holy Synod. All Christians are cautioned about him and are instructed to have nothing to do with him.

Monokondylion

1. See above No. 4.

2. Polyphengos was a diocese in the metropolis of Korinth. Hypselantes (p. 122) informs us that the diocese was abolished under Patriarch Neophytos in 1605.

33 (25-26)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon kai synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1698, Indiction 6

The monastery of St. John the Baptist and Fore-runner in the province of Serres, whose stavropegeion rank had been approved by chrysovoula issued by the Orthodox Emperors Andronikos Palaiologos the Elder,¹ Andronikos Palaiologos the Younger,² the Most-high Krales of Serbia,³ and by a sigillion of the then Patriarch Isaias,⁴ is hereby confirmed. The present confirmation includes a second monastery of St. John, built within the city of Serres, various monastic celles, the tsiphtilikion⁵ of Toumpitza, and all other dependencies (metochia).

The second monastery within the city is a dependency of the other near Mount Menoikys. Both are considered to be one monastery under the direction of a sole hegoumenos. They were built through the spiritual zeal and efforts of Metropolitan /Ioakeim/ of Zychna.⁶

As a sign of its dependency, the monastery is required to pay 400 dramia of saffron annually and to commemorate the patriarch's name. Christians, however, living on the dependencies are required to pay the usual obligations to Metropolitan Anthimos of Serres:⁷ zetia, clergy fees (kanonikon), and wedding fees (synoikesia). Moreover, the monks, who are counseled to live in peace and harmony, are free to elect their own

hegoumenos and when in need of ordinations, to invite any hierarch they please.

This action is taken by the Great Church of Christ to assist the monks of St. John who have fallen on hard times and are few in number.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Kyprianos of Smyrna, †Ioakeim of Ankyra, †Daniel of Anchialos, †Philaretos of Thebes, †Makarios of Paronaxia, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Text: Andre Guillou, *Les archives de Saint-Jean-Prodrôme sur le mont Ménécée* ("Bibliothèque Byzantine, Documents 3," ed. P. Lemerle, Paris, 1955), pp. 146-49. Guillou's text, in his superb study with full bibliography, is dated November 1698, Indiction 7 and has some different episcopal signatories. I suspect he read a different copy, one similar to that found below in No. 39 of the MS. The latter, unlike his, has no signatories.

Cited: Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 613; Aimilianos, pp. 474-75; Karapiperes, p. 109, and many others.

1. Andronikos II (1282-1328). For the documents issued by Andronikos on behalf of the monastery, see Guillou, *Les archives*, pp. 39-56, 59-63, 66-81.

2. Andronikos III (1328-1341). For his documents, see *ibid.*, pp. 56-59, 81-99, 104-08.

3. This is Stephan Dusan, King and Emperor of Serbia (1331-1343). His documents, *ibid.*, pp. 120-44.

4. Isaias I was Patriarch of Constantinople from 1323-1334. His sigillion in *ibid.*, pp. 64-65.

5. Turkish: *ciftlik*, a farm.

6. Ioakeim's chronology is not clear; about the first quarter of the fourteenth century. See Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 141.

7. In the MS: Aug. 1698-7 Aug. 1702; Nos. 33, 39, 73, 84, 85. Inclusive dates: 1678-1706; P. T. Pennas, *Historia ton Serron* (Athens, 1966), p. 461; Stogioglou, *TEE*, XI, 116.

34 (26b-27)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchike kai synodike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1698, Indiction 6

Patriarch Kallinikos II, to whom Metropolitan [Genadios] of Chios¹ had written, complaining of disorders in his metropolis created by monks, rules that monks may not usurp the rights of the metropolitan by performing services in parishes without his permission. In addition, *hegoumenoi* may not remove their monasteries from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan. Except for those monasteries enjoying *stavropegion* rank, all others are under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan and may not commemorate the name of the Patriarch in place of that of the metropolitan. Those who are guilty of the above uncanonical conduct are threatened with suspension and anathema. This includes laymen who participate in such actions as well as the clergy.

Monokondylion

Text: Gedeon (*Diataxeis*, II, 397-400) omits the last two lines of the text; Phoropoulos, *EA*, XIX (1899), 142-43.

Cited: Karapiperes, p. 107.

1. See above No. 12.

35 (28-29)

LETTER OF ABSOLUTION

Patriarchikon sygchoretikon gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1698, Indiction 6

A letter of absolution¹ issued for the late Voevode John (Ioannes) Constantin² by Patriarch Kallinikos II and the Holy Synod with the participation of Patriarch Dositheos II of Jerusalem.

Monokondylion

Text: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Documente Privotoare la Istoria Românilor: Texte Grecesti Privotoare la Istoria Romaneasca* (Bucarest, 1909), XIII, 389-92. Cited: Delikanes, III, 361.

1. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 15-16 for other examples of letters of absolution.

2. Constantine Serban Cantacuzenos of Wallachia (1679-1688).

36 (30)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchikon kai synodikon epitagma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

[6] August 1698, Indiction 6

An encyclical letter addressed to the metropolitans and archbishops, whose sees border on the "White" [Aegean] Sea, to their officials, clergy, archons, and "blessed Christians." They are all counseled and advised to disregard the letter of recommendation written by the Metropolitan of Philadelphia¹ on behalf of Ioannes Stages (Staes).²

Ioannes Stages is not to be received as an exarch,

teacher, or priest, nor may any clergyman co-celebrate with him, or any layman listen to him or accept him as a clergyman. Those who do, regardless of their rank or station, are excommunicated.

Stages, who derives from Kydonia, Krete, is unknown as a clergyman, while Metropolitan Meletios is a self-appointed exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Meletios has no right to appoint Stages exarch, preacher, confessor, or teacher.³ In fact, Meletios is not truly a metropolitan, for a metropolitan bears the title of his see, which he does not, has bishops under him, and has authority over many cities, towns, and churches. This is not true of Meletios who is merely a titular hierarch.

[†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Nikodemos of Derkos] ⁴

Monokondyliion

Text: Perikles Zerlentes, "Ioannes Staes exarchos Meletiou tou Philadelphias," *Nesiotike Epeteris*, I (1918), 256-60. Here the letter is dated 6 August 1698. Cited: Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Vivliotheke*, IV, 368 and I, 447 with signatures.

1. The metropolitan of Philadelphia had his seat in Venice and was responsible for the Orthodox of that city and those living outside of the Ottoman Empire in Western Europe.

Meletios Typaldos, who served as metropolitan of Philadelphia from 1685 to June 1712 when he was deposed, was born on the island of Kephallenia, studied in Italy, and taught school in the Greek community of Venice whose metropolitan he became.

His letter of recommendation for Ioannes Stages (Staes), a proselytizer for the Papacy, is an indication of Meletios' pro-Papal sympathies. It is said that he was promised a cardinal's hat for which he was willing to submit himself and the Greek Orthodox community of Venice under the authority of the Papacy. As a consequence, Metropolitan Meletios was deposed and unfrocked by the Holy Synod under Patriarch Kyrillos IV in June 1712. He died on 6 May 1713.

Because of Meletios' near defection, the Patriarchate did not name a successor in Venice for over a century. The Greek com-

munity was during this time headed by an “administrator” chosen from among the clergy of the city. See Ioannes Veloudes, *Chrysovoulla kai Grammata ton Oikoumenikon Patriarchon* (Venice, 1873), pp. 53-78; Konstantinos Sathas, *Neohellenike Philologia* (Athens, 1868), pp. 454-56.

2. Ioannes Stages (Staes) was born on the island of Siphnos to a family originating in Krete. He studied at the College of St. Athanasios in Rome from which he was expelled. Nevertheless, he maintained his loyalty to Rome. He apparently fitted in with Metropolitan Meletios’ plan to spread Latin propaganda among the Greeks living on the islands under Venetian occupation. Hence the letter of recommendation written by Meletios on 13 July 1697. It was in response to this letter that Patriarch Kallinikos II wrote the above encyclical letter.

Later, Stages traveled to Romania, Hungary, Malta, the Peloponnesos, and the Greek islands trying to subvert the Orthodox. In 1711, Venice, in one of her frequent shifts in policy, forced his appointment as head of the Greek Orthodox Church of St. George in Venice. Here Stages continued his attempts to force the community to submit to Rome. He was not successful. For the text of Meletios’ letter of recommendation, see Zerlentes, *Nesiotike Epeteris*, I, (1918), 254-56 and pp. 251-54.

3. Meletios had addressed his letter, recommending Stages, to all the Greek hierarchs, clergy, abbots, and Christians under the jurisdiction of Venice. Moreover, he introduced Stages as an hieromonk graced with wisdom and knowledge, a great theologian and teacher of the Orthodox Church, with authority to preach, teach, hear confessions, and to arbitrate disputes. In addition Stages received the right to tonsure monks and nuns, and to ordain readers. Wherever there was no bishop, he was to have the bishop’s place. These were, indeed, extraordinary powers and charges for one whose loyalty was suspect and who was unknown to the Patriarchate. *Ibid.*, pp. 254-56.

4. Signatures do not appear in the MS copy above but they do appear in the copy read by Zerlentes (p. 260) and Papadopoulos-Kerameus *Vivliotheke*, I, 447.

37 (29b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

28 August 1698, Indiction 6

Metropolitan Makarios, formerly of Melenikon [Melnik]¹ is elected Metropolitan of Lemnos² to succeed Galaktion who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Makarios and Hieromonk Laurentios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Ioakeim of Ankyra, †Philaretos of Thebes, †Neophytos of Gothia, †Metrophanes of . . .

1. Inclusive dates: 1689-sometime before 28 Aug. 1698, transferred to Lemnos. Gritsopoulos (TEE, VIII, 925) lists Makarios from 1689-1696.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 28 Aug. 1698-? Unknown to Ateses in Lemnos and TEE, VIII, 287.

3. See above No. 27.

38 (30b-31)

JOINING OF SEES

Henotikon patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

October 1698, Indiction 7

The patriarchal exarchate of Kerasous¹ is joined to the metropolis of Trapezous [Trebizond] upon the petition of Metropolitan Nektarios of Trapezous.² Nektarios asks for this addition not to enlarge his see but in order to have a place to retire, rest, and escape from time to time the "tyranny of the oppressors." Included in the exarchate are the villages of Tripolis and Koralon. The annual payment of 30 grosia made by the exarchate are, however, to continue to be paid to Dikaiophylax Spantones.³

[†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Ioakeim of Ankyra]⁴

Monokondylion

Cited: Chrysanthos, Trapezous, p. 580; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke, I, 214; Karapiperes, p. 109; Gedeon, Pinakes, p. 612; Aimilianos, p. 475.

1. For the exarchate of Kerasous, see Chrysanthos, Trapezous, pp. 582-83.

2. Inclusive dates: 1689-1706; *ibid.*, pp. 580-84.

3. See above No. 1, n 34.

4. The signatures are not in the above copy but are found in the original read by Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Vivliotheke, I, 214.

39 (31b-32)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes epivevaioterion gramma
Patriarch Kallinikos II
November 1698, Indiction 7

Confirmation of the stavropegion rank of the Monastery of St. John the Baptist and Forerunner together with all of its dependencies.

[†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Nikodemos of Derkos, †Athanasios of Adrianople, †Anthimos of Serres, †Gregorios of Prespa] ¹

1. This is Guillou's (*Les archives*, pp. 146-49) text. The signatories are taken from his copy. For the others, see above No. 33.

40 (23b)

ELECTION

Ekloge

Patriarch Kallinikos II

17 February 1699, Indiction 7

Metropolitan Gregorios of Klaudioupolis¹ is elected Archbishop of Andros² to succeed Nathanael who died.³

Other candidates: Hieromonk Germanos and Hieromonk Makarios

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Ioakeim of Ankyra, †Pachomios of Ikonion,⁴ †Nikodemos of Derkos

Cited: Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, p. 137; D. P. Paschales, "He Ekklesia tes Androu," *Andriaka Chronika*, I (1948), p. 73.

1. Inclusive dates: ? - 17 Feb. 1699, elected Archbishop of Andros; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XII, 1078.

2. Inclusive dates: Elected, 17 Feb. 1699-? 1701-1705, 1713. Sphyroeras, *TEE*, II, 721. Gregorios, whose family name was Dapontes and was a native of the island of Andros, was succeeded in 1705 by Athanasios who continued in office until 1713 when he regained the see for a third time. How long he remained is not known. See Paschales, *Andriaka Chronika*, I, (1948), pp. 73-74.

3. Inclusive dates: 1691-sometime before 17 Feb. 1699 when his successor Gregorios was elected and he is cited as dead; *ibid.*, p. 73; Sphyroeras, *TEE*, II, 721.

4. Inclusive dates: Unknown. He is unknown to Nikolopoulos (*TEE*, VI, 860).

A PLEDGE

Hyposcheterion

Patriarch Kallinikos II

March 1699, Indiction 7

Archbishop [Zosimas], formerly of Achrida (Ohrid),¹ who was elected **proedros** of the Archdiocese of Elasson & Domenikon to provide him with an income, promises to fulfill certain obligations and to refrain from certain practices. To wit: he agrees to be addressed as "His Beatitude, the former Archbishop of Achrida and Proedros of the Archdiocese of Elasson & Domenikon;" he promises not to sign with green ink or to wear a mitre during the celebration of the Holy Liturgy; he pledges not to set up a throne in the midst of the other hierarchs when co-celebrating; to commemorate the name of the Ecumenical Patriarch; to respect the privileges of the Ecumenical Throne; to keep peace and to cause no trouble for the Patriarchate either by speech, act, letter, directly or indirectly.

In addition, Zosimas promises to fulfill certain financial obligations to pay the **zetia** and **voetheia** which is fixed at 25,000 aspers annually, the imperial **charatsi** (**karadj**) of 70 **aslania**, the 1,150 **aslania** owed to Kyritzes Zacharias, the **aspers** of Zagorianos, given for the ordination of Zacharias who was the Archbishop of Elasson & Domenikon,² and, in general, all the indebtedness of the archdiocese.

Text: Delikanes, III, 811-12.

1. Zosimas' name is not mentioned in the document nor did he sign this copy of the original pledge. Inclusive dates: Elected, 9 July 1695-Mar. 1699. His successor Raphael was elected on 8 June 1699. In that election document, Zosimas is cited as having been expelled. Both election documents in Delikanes, III, 803-07, 807-09.

Zosimas was Metropolitan of Sisanion (belonged to the Archdiocese of Achrida) when elected, while Raphael was the former

Bishop of Chaironesos (belonged to Crete); *ibid.* In 1708 Zosimas returned as Archbishop of Achrida but was replaced in the following year by Dionysios; see Anthimos of Velegrada, "Epistoliaia semeiosis peri tou Sisaniou Zosima," *EA*, III, 150 and Vailhé, *Dictionnaire*, I, 324.

2. See above No. 19.

42 (33b-34)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Synodike apophasis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
1699, Indiction 7

The village of St. Stephanos, situated outside of Parapola, in the province of Derkos & Neochorion, is declared to be under the jurisdiction of the local metropolitan and is not of stavropegion rank. Both the village and the *hagiasma* of the Theotokos at Phloria belong to the metropolis. The action brought forward by Vestiaros Chourmouzes¹ to retain the village as a patriarchal exarchate is denied, although he is to continue to receive 25 *grosia* annually during his lifetime.

In the time of Patriarch Parthenios IV "from Prousa,"² "a troublemaker" named Chrysogonos succeeded in detaching the village. Later, others did the same with the *hagiasma*. Metropolitan Makarios of Derkos & Neochorion³ brought suit in the synodical court under Patriarch Dionysios IV "the Younger"⁴ and they were returned to his see. When Patriarch Parthenios IV returned to office, he also confirmed this action. But in the time of Patriarch Iakovos I,⁵ Chourmouzes, then a Protovestiaros, tried to reclaim them at a meeting held in the home of the Patriarch. He was successful. Hence the above decision, based upon documents and witnesses who testified that the village and *hagiasma* belonged to the metropolis. All documents,

therefore, stating the contrary are declared to be invalid.⁶

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Ignatios of Thessalonike, †Anthimos of Ikonion⁷

Monokondylion

1. Also cited below in No. 45 holding the office of Dikaio-phylax.

2. Parthenios served as patriarch five times: 1 May 1657-end of June 1662, 21 Oct. 1665-9 Sept. 1667, beginning Mar. -7 Sept. 1671, 1 Jan. 1675-29 July 1676, and 10 Mar. 1684-20 Mar. 1685. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 28-29 for a short biographical sketch.

3. In the MS: 1699; Nos. 42, 45. Inclusive dates: 11 Sept. 1673-c Sept. 1688, when his successor Nikodemos was elected and he is cited as having resigned; Germanos, *Thrakika*, VI, 66 n 4. Stavrides (TEE, IV, 1116-17) ends Makarios' tenure in Oct. and begins Nikodemos' in Sept. 1688. See, too, Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 48, n 7. Makarios' suit was brought sometime after Patriarch Dionysios' first term and before his fifth as patriarch. See following note. Makarios had previously served as Archbishop of Agathoupolis: 6 January 1660-1673: Germanos, XIII, 118.

4. Patriarch Dionysios also served as patriarch on five different occasions: 8 Nov. 1671-25 July 1673, 29 July 1676-2 Aug. 1679, 30 July 1682-10 Mar. 1684, end of Mar. 1686-12 Oct. 1687, and Aug. 1693-Apr. 1694. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, pp. 63-64 for a brief sketch.

5. Unlike Parthenios and Dionysios, Iakovos served only three times as patriarch: 10 Aug. 1679-30 July 1682, 20 Mar. 1685-end of Mar. 1686, and 12 Oct. 1687-3 Mar. 1688. See Vaporis, *Aspects*, p. 54.

6. See below No. 45 for more on this controversy.

7. In the MS: May 1699-23 May 1701; Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, 73, 75. Inclusive dates: May 1699-23 May 1701. He is unknown to Nikolopoulos (TEE, VI, 860) who lists Parthenios in 1638, followed by Klemes and Silvestros in 1721.

43 (35-36)

CONFIRMATION

Sigillion Gramma
Patriarch Kallinikos II
May 1699, Indiction 9

The monastery of the Theotokos, called Vernikova, in the diocese of Loidorikion, metropolis of Naupaktos & Arta, is confirmed in its **stavropegion** rank. Letters of confirmation were presented bearing the signatures of emperors Alexios Komnenos,¹ Manouel Porphyrogenetos,² Angelos Doukas,³ and Andronikos.⁴

As a sign of its dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is required to pay 10 **okades** of red caviar (**augotarachon**) annually.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon,

†Anthimos of Ikonion, †Nikodemos of Derkos

Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon, **Pinakes**, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 109; Aimilianos, p. 475.

1. Alexios Komnenos I (1081-1118).

2. Manouel I Porphyrogenetos (1143-1180).

3. Probably Michael Doukas Komnenos Angelos, creator of the separatist state of Epeiros. See Demetrios I. Polemis, **The Doukai** (London, 1968), p. 91 and notes 5 and 9.

4. Andronikos I (1183-1185).

44 (36b)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Synodike apophasis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
June 1699, Indiction 7

Metropolitan [Makarios] of Paronaxia,¹ his officials, archons, and clergy are informed that the monasteries of St. Antonios, Hagia Mone, St. Kyrnake, Taxiarchai (Archangels), Apostle Andreas, St. George, St. John the Theologian on the island of Paros and those on the island of Naxos: Holy Cross, Taxiarchai, and Kalogritza are of stavropegion rank. Therefore, they are all exempt from paying the etesion tax. Each, however, is required to pay 6 okades of cheese annually, with the exception of St. John which pays only 4 okades because it is poorer than the rest. This obligation must be fulfilled beginning with the coming 8th indiction.²

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Anthimos of Ikonion, †Nikodemos of Derkos
Monokondylion

Cited: Gedeon (Pinakes, p. 613) dates the document in July as does Karapiperes (p. 109) who follows him.

1. See above No. 4.

2. That is, September 1699.

45 (34b)

SETTLEMENT

Synodike apophasis
Patriarch Kallinikos II
June 1699, Indiction 7

A settlement is reached between Metropolitan Nikodemos of Derkos & Neochorion and Dikaiophylax Chourmouzes over the **hagiasma** of the Theotokos, at the place called Phlorion, in the village of St. Stephanos. Metropolitan Nikodemos claimed the **hagiasma** was part of his metropolis and that Dikaiophylax Chourmouzes had usurped it and claimed it to be a part of the exarchate given to him.¹

It is agreed that the **hagiasma** does in fact belong to the metropolis, but that the Dikaiophylax is to be compensated with 90 grosia. Whoever attempts to change this agreement is to be anathematized.²

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Anthimos of Ikonion
Monokondylion

1. Lay officials of the Patriarchate were compensated by receiving the income of various exarchates and **hagiasmata** of the Church. Hence, although the **hagiasma** in question belonged to the metropolis, it still had to provide the income to the official. It appears that there were no direct salaries paid by the Patriarchate to its officials.

2. See above No. 42 for the beginning of this dispute.

46 (37-38)

CONFIRMATION

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1699, Indiction 7

Hegoumenos Philaretos, the hieromonk and pneumatikos, appeared before the Holy Synod in Constantinople and petitioned for the confirmation of the **stavropegion** rank of the Monastery of St. John the Forerunner, founded by Hieromonk Symeon, at the place called Dokimou in the Archdiocese of Skiathos & Skopelos. The petition is granted and includes the three chapels of Hypapante, St. Charalampos, and St. Varvara. The petition was supported by archons, officials, and gerontes of the archdiocese as well as by a letter issued by Patriarch Timotheos II.¹ As a sign of dependency upon the Patriarchate, the monastery is to pay 3 liters of wax annually.

Moreover, the monastic community is reminded that no women, religious or lay, are permitted within the

monastery, nor are children, even for the purposes of schooling.

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kallinikos of Euripos.²

Monokondylion

1. Patriarch Timotheos II Marmarenos of Constantinople was a native of Panormos in the province of Kyzikos. Previous to his election, he served as metropolitan of Patras from 1601-1612. In the latter year, he combined with Paisios of Thessalonike, Timotheos of Larissa, and Germanos, formerly of Mesemvria and successfully ousted Kyrillos I Loukaris who was serving as administrator of the Patriarchate.

Timotheos is also known for his attempts to curb Jesuit activity in the areas of the Patriarchate and for rebuilding the church of St. George at the Phanar where the Patriarchate had moved in 1601. In addition, Patriarch Timotheos deposed Archbishop Laurentios of Mount Sinai for daring to wear, for the first time and contrary to tradition, a mitre during the celebration of the Eucharist.

Timotheos died in office, being poisoned under mysterious circumstances and was succeeded by Kyrillos I Loukaris on 4 November 1620; Germanos, *Orthodoxia*, IX (1934), 487-89; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 549-50; Hypselantes, pp. 129-30; P. G. Nikolopoulos, *TEE*, XI, 774.

2. In the MS: Aug. 1699-Jan. 1700; Nos. 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54. Inclusive dates: Aug. 1699-Jan. 1700. Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XV, 1422; Gritsopoulos, *TEE*, V, 1072.

47 (38b-39)

RESTORATION

Patriarchike apophasis

Patriarch Kallinikos II

August 1699, Indiction 7

The officials, clergy, archons, and "blessed Christians" of the diocese of Kydonia [Krete] are informed that the lawful bishop of their diocese is Bishop Arsenios¹ who is restored to his rank and position with all rights. Bishop Arsenios is to collect the *kanonikon* (clergy fee), the *synoikesia* (marriage fees), the *panegyria* (fees from feasts), the *zestia*, and any other fees that are peculiar to the diocese.²

The letter was occasioned by the ordination of the "degenerate" Pophyrios as Bishop of Kydonia³ by Metropolitan Kallinikos of Krete⁴ after Bishop Arsenios had been removed and deposed illegally without reference to the Great Church of Christ. In effect, Kallinikos had performed a false ordination (*phalsocheirotonia*).

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kyrillos of Prousa, †Kallinikos of Euripos, †Konstantios of Ganos & Chora, †Metrophanes of Proikonesos,⁵ †Romanos of Agathoupolis.⁶

1. Inclusive dates: before Aug. 1699-1705, died. Germanos, *EPH*, XXXIV, (1935), 436; Phoropoulos, *TEE*, VII, 1083; Janin, *Dictionnaire*, XIII, 1144-45; Tomadakes, *EEKS*, III, 143.

2. Except for the *zestia*, all are regular sources of episcopal income.

3. Inclusive dates: unknown.

4. See above No. 21.

5. In the MS: Aug. 1699 - sometime before 15 Mar. 1702 when he is cited as dead and his successor Theokletos was elected. Nos. 47, 83. Inclusive dates: 1677 - about 15 Mar. 1702, cited as dead. Gritsopoulos (*TEE*, X, 613) lists Metrophanes from 1677-

1698. He does not know of No. 83 below which lists Theokletos' election in succession of Metrophanes.

6. Inclusive dates: 1699-1701; Gritsopoulos, TEE, I, 105; S. Pétridès, Dictionnaire, I, 922; Germanos, Thrakika, VIII, 119.

48 (39b-40)

Patriarchikon synodikon sigilliodes epivevaioterion gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

September 1699, Indiction 8

The stavropegion rank of the monastery of the Theotokos, called Batzkovou, in the metropolis of Philippoupolis, including its dependencies (metochia) and the five chapels of SS Athanasios, Nicholas, Demetrios, and that of Prophet Elias is confirmed. Included in the confirmation are the metochion of St. George and the chapels of SS Demetrios, John the Forerunner, the Taxiarchai, and Prophet Elias situated above the village of Ablianos, and those of the Panagia, SS Nicholas and Paraskeve within the village.

The stavropegion rank of the monastery, its dependencies, and chapels had been confirmed in the past by Patriarch Parthenios IV.¹

†Patriarch Kallinikos of Constantinople

†Neophytos of Heraklia, †Kyrillos of Kyzikos, †Parthenios of Nikomedia, †Gabriel of Chalkedon, †Kallinikos of Euripos, †Athanasios of Drystra

Monokondy lion

Cited: Gedeon, Pinakes, p. 613; Karapiperes, p. 109; Aimilianos, p. 475.

1. See above No. 42.

EXONERATION

Patriarchike kai synodike athoosis kai sygchoresis
 Patriarch Kallinikos II
 September 1699, Indiction 8

Hieromonk Nektarios is declared innocent of the death of Metropolitan Gregorios Kontares of Smyrna.¹

Nektarios was Gregorios' **ephemerios** [chaplain]. They had quarreled and actually came to blows with the metropolitan pulling out hair from Nektarios' head. Later, the metropolitan suffered a stroke and it was rumored that he had been murdered by his chaplain. Nektarios was consequently unfrocked.

In his defense before the Holy Synod, Nektarios was able to demonstrate that government officials had examined Gregorios' body and saw no evidence of murder. They ruled he had died of apoplexy and issued a statement to that effect. Therefore, Nektarios is given permission to resume his priestly function.

Text: major portion in Solomonides, *Smyrna*, pp. 170-71.

1. See above No. 26.

50 (43b-44)

PATRIARCHAL RULING

Patriarchiko gramma

Patriarch Kallinikos II

September 1699, Indiction 8

A letter addressed to Metropolitan Gennadios of Chios¹ in response to a letter received from the archons of Chios who complained of hieromonk Petrales. The hieromonk had contracted according to the letter, a **kepenion** marriage² and was suspended by the metropolitan. But Petrales claimed that he was found innocent of the charge and wished to continue in his priestly capacity. The archons, however, contented that this was not permitted by the canons of the Church.

Patriarch Kallinikos answers that the archons are correct insofar as canon law is concerned, but finds the accusation made against the hieromonk not very well founded in fact. It is based on heresays and not on eyewitness evidence. Moreover, both witnesses and prosecutors (*davaci*) were the same persons, something which is not permissible.

After apprehension, Patriarch Kallinikos advises, both parties must be brought before the court, the accused and the accusers, not only the accusers. If the accused denies his guilt, witnesses must be brought forth and examined carefully. Only then may judgment be rendered. In addition, the witnesses must be sworn, otherwise "any whore can accuse any priest of being the father of her child."

Finally, the Patriarch informs Metropolitan Gennadios that the hieromonk had gone to Constantinople and asked to be tried. He was found innocent. But the

case can be reopened if proper evidence was furnished. Gennadios is also told that he is, in the final analysis, master of his own province and is free to do as he pleases.

Monokondylion

1. See above No. 12.

2. A **kapenion** marriage was one in which a man took a woman as his wife and promised her compensation, mutually agreed upon, if and when he divorced her. This type of marriage often took place between Muslim men and Christian women. Later, the custom was also followed by some Christians as well.

Patriarch Parthenios IV succeeded in his third term of office (Mar. 1671-8 Nov. 1671) in getting **kapenion** marriages between Muslims and Christians declared illegal by the Ottoman authorities. The Church, of course, had never accepted them. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the practice continued among Christians into the eighteenth century. See Arampatzoglou, *Orthodoxia*, IV (1929), 162-64; *idem*, *Photieios*, I, 62, 66-67, II, 34-36.

(To be continued)

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE DIVINE LIGHT IN THE POETRY OF ST. SYMEON THE NEW THEOLOGIAN (949-1025)

By DEMETRI STATHOPOULOS

1. The Meaning of the Divine Light

The poetry of St. Symeon the New Theologian contains the deepest and the most remarkable teaching about the Divine Light that is to be found in the tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church and in Christian literature in general.¹

St. Symeon speaks many times and in diverse ways about that which is "incomparable and completely unexpressible."² In his poetry the word "light" itself occurs hundreds of times, and in many other places he expresses it by terms related to it, as we will see later.

What is the nature of this marvelous light? To understand this question better we must go back to the New Testament, which is the main source of his inspiration. The life which fills the "Incarnate Word" of God is the Light which came into the world.³ But we may say that it was from the "Father of Lights"⁴ that St. Symeon drew his theology of Light, which astounds our hearts. The coming of the Light into the World through the incarnate Lord is, for St. Symeon, the call to the "marvelous Light" of God.⁵ Through his continuous contact with the person of the Incarnate Logos ("Word"), who was transfigured in glory and resurrected from the dead, he experienced the vision of the Lord's Divine Person rising like the sun from the depth of his heart. It was by the Light of this Sun that the Divine Wisdom taught him in all its fullness and bestowed on him "the knowledge of the glory of God."⁶

The Divine Light is the expression of the face of God, his glance upon thirsty man, which penetrates his whole being. This Light is of the same nature as the Light of the Transfiguration and as the fiery tongues of Pentecost. St. Symeon calls it "Divine Spirit." God in His essence is not to be seen by man, but man can see the outflowings (*aporroiai*) of his Light and "the rays of his

Divinity,"⁷ which is the manifestation of God Himself.⁸ "Your Light is you, my God."⁹ For that reason we cannot express its very essence. But its various energies can be described. Instead of efforts to interpret or to understand it, man must continually seek this Light and pray that his heart may be filled with it.¹⁰ Only in this way he can succeed in his efforts to comprehend it. Many times when St. Symeon speaks of the Divine Light he expresses his impressions of it by means of antitheses. The Divine Light is the "visibly invisible, space-consuming and yet spaceless!"¹¹ The Light, being beyond every created thing, itself uncreated, is incomprehensibly comprehensible, and describable only in an "indescribable way."¹²

Its shining in the heart of man is mental (*noera*).¹³ The Light is intangible, and thus only the intellect can contain it.¹⁴ Its form is unspeakable and its beauty is all surpassing.¹⁵

Physical Light may be described as a material, bodily Light, which differs from the spiritual one. Physical Light is divisible by nature, as when one candle is divided from another light continues to be given with no further connection with the source. The spiritual Light, on the contrary, is undivided and unceasing; but it shines continually and lightens all creation.¹⁶ At the same time, it remains immeasurable and "inseparable" from its source. Although it is given to many different souls, it still remains undivided.¹⁷

Sometimes the Light speaks with the tongue of God. God Himself speaks through it: "Believe that I am Light without any form/simple, and a unity, undivided by nature/indiscernable at all, accessible inaccessibly."¹⁸

It is not the fault of the Light "that it is seen in different forms" (*metaschematizomenon*).¹⁹ These forms are the results of the imperfections and weakness of human nature. Every relationship between God and man in the process of man's "deification" can be expressed in terms of the Light. The commandments of God are Light,²⁰ and man's love for God is also Light.²¹ All creatures are included in "the Light of the day of the Lord." The only language with which the creature can communicate with the Creator is the Light, which at last brings beatitude and wholeness (*plerotes*) to those who sincerely love it.

The presence of the Divine Light takes the place of words. It gives freedom to man, offering to him the universal language of the Holy Spirit. The Divine Light in the world is the continuous repetition of the miracle of Pentecost. Through the Language of

the Fire, man becomes a citizen of the future "city of God."²²

Whenever the Divine Light dominates people's hearts, history counts a step towards the eternal values and towards its own fulfillment. The Light has no dwelling place either in Heaven or in earth,²³ and cannot be confined to space.²⁴ If we were to consider it as having a dwelling place here on earth, it might be described.²⁵

If we consider it as occupying a certain space, we attribute magnitude to it, but on the contrary it is completely without size (*amegethes to parapan hyparchei*).²⁶ We describe with our language things having some form. For the mystic, as being himself within the Light, there is no question of form, because there no longer exists any distance between the subject and the object. He has overcome the borders of form, and he has succeeded in soaring above time and space. From the moment that the Light is dwelling within him and he within the Light, he has taken the path to the heights. This Light accompanies the saints and is the panoply of the Holy Trinity. We ourselves can see it, but can only stand speechless in awe. Only the Light can reveal itself and speak about its own nature.

2. Names and Forms of the Divine Light.

The names given to the Divine Light are many, although it is one in essence. The Light says: "There is no name for me in the human language."²⁷ The variety of names shows the incapacity of language to express its fulness. Nevertheless, the power of the mystic's experience obliges him to speak. By means of images and pictures taken from nature and everyday life, St. Symeon tries to express and describe that which has no name at all.²⁸ In accordance with its various manifestations, he calls it "star," "sun," "ray," "spark," "flame," "fire," "warmth," "brightness," "the rising of the sun," "a column of fire," and sometimes also he uses expressions such as "the ocean," "the spring," "the drop of water." Note that all these words express the energies of the Divine Light and not its essence. St. Symeon also uses many nouns and adjectives to express it, e.g. "peace," "joy," "calmness," "mercy," "help," "deliverer," "protection," "dress," "glory."²⁹

Let us examine more closely the forms and ways in which the Divine Light appears, and the effect which it has on the heart of the poet. In the beginning, the Light is seen as a star from afar off; and afterwards, when the intellect is opened and purified, it is seen as the sun and even greater than the sun."³⁰ As the sun rises within me in my poor heart, or as the face of the sun like a sphere,

luminously like a flame."³¹ At another time it appears as the ray of the sun, because the sun itself blinds.³² But when St. Symeon sees one ray only, he desires to see the whole of its source and says: "Who can show me what I see?"³³ Then the rays multiply and the mystic poet says: "Where can I find the source of the rays?"³⁴ But he understands soon that the one ray includes the whole sun. With astonishment in his heart, he says in a paradoxical way: "Who can give me what I have?"³⁵ How he holds the ray in his hands and climbs or rides on it to approach the sun. But whenever he approaches it, he thinks he can touch it, and then he loses the ray and falls down blind. "I am now at a standstill and cry and seek the lost ray," because it was to me "a heavenly rope."³⁶ The Divine Light is seen also as effulgence or splendor (aigle) but only when man has passed by the way of nakedness, separation from his own, self abandonment, denial of the world, patience in temptation, prayer, compunction and humility. This delicate splendor surrounds the mind suddenly at lightning speed, in order not to injure man in his child-like weakness. Because of this lightning speed, he cannot understand, he cannot recall its beauty; and being like a child, he cannot take the food of a man.³⁷ Only a perfect man, or saint, can enjoy that Splendor whenever he likes. The imperfect man can have it only when it is given to him in his need and not whenever he desires it.³⁸

The Creator is likened to a candle which shines to every one in the world.³⁹ Another expressive idea used for the Light is that of the form of fire. In order to understand better the relation between man and the Light, St. Symeon uses the following image.⁴⁰ The soul is likened to a lamp. The oil in it is a man's virtue, the wick which holds the flame is the intellect. The Light in the form as it were of fire kindles the lamp, which lightens the soul and its dwelling-place, the body. This kindling drives out the various passions: hate, envy, ambition, egoism. These passions are compared to a mouse. Little by little, the mouse eats the wick and drinks the oil whenever a man becomes dominated by the aforementioned passions. The Divine Fire desires always to kindle the lamp of the soul, but never forces man's freedom. Man's own freedom will have to play its part in the preparation (*proeutrepisis*) for accepting and receiving the Fire. Everyone ought to pray to receive this Holy Fire, because it reveals and shows the Will of God to him. When it shines and the lamp is lit, the house of the soul is cleansed. Then it mingles with the soul, and yet is not confused with it, but is united in a mystical way with it in the

whole of its substance, and glorifies it little by little.⁴¹ This unity and unmixed mingling of the soul with the Light could be compared with "Fire in iron, and light in glass."⁴² The Divine Light is likened also to the water of the ocean. When man receives a drop of it he is so attracted to it that he desires to include in himself the whole ocean. Is this foolishness on man's part? The Light of God is like the wide waters of the sea. He who stands on the edge of the sea sees the water but cannot drink the whole of what he sees. He can hold in his hand a few drops, but not the whole ocean, for the waters are far more than what he sees. "How is it possible to see the whole? It is endless before one's eyes; it's also impossible to hold it in your hands . . ."⁴³

At other times, St. Symeon speaks of the manner of the Light's approach. Once he was reading a book; the Divine Light from above seemed to appear in the light of the candle and entered his heart. Its brightness was such that all things, and even the candle itself disappeared. He forgot his material existence. He experienced this light descending upon him through the air, as it were in the form of a radiant column or pillar.

3. The Divine Light.

The theological significance of the Divine Light is immense. Through it, St. Symeon attempts to explain the mystery of the Holy Trinity. The unity of the Light signifies the unconfused unity of the Three Persons of the Trinity. This is why he calls it."

"O nameless Light, you are a totally unnameable, and yet you have at the same time many names. You give life and movement to all things (*os energoun ta panta*). O unique glory and origin and dominion, one Will, one Mind, one Power."⁴⁴ As the Light is one with the soul and at the same time each one keeps its identity without any confusion, so the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity are united in the Light. "The Father is Light, the Son is Light, the Holy Ghost is Light—One Light in all Three, One but Indivisible."⁴⁵

In another verse St. Symeon writes thus about the Holy Trinity: "The Trinity appears to me as it were a face which has two eyes full of Light."⁴⁶

In various places the Light is described in relation to one or other of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. St. Symeon recounts the following miracle: "In one night the Heavens opened in front of him. Jesus Christ appeared as a "Light in Light . . ."⁴⁷

The Holy Trinity is the source of the Divine Light. In the very first it comes to man. "You, O merciful God, visited me and caused me to return to You through the shining of your Light, being myself in darkness. You drew me to Yourself, my Creator."⁴⁸

The Divine Light is thus an emphatic expression of the Love of God for man. Indeed St. Symeon identifies the Love with the Light. And even when this Light disappears from his eyes this too is a sign of God's love for him. "Only those who love you, O my God, you know and love, and in gracious mercy you show Yourself to them."⁴⁹ The Love of God is like a searching Light or the love of a mother for her anxious child.

4. Why Man Desires the Divine Light.

"O merciful God, my Creator, shine forth once more your unapproachable Light so that my heart may be filled with joy."⁵⁰ The search for joy from above and the everlasting passion for fulfillment brought the steps of St. Symeon always nearer to the Divine Light. For when man, through his continuous contact with the Light, succeeds in entering into its depth, he finds his deification. But within the limits of space and time, man feels himself always to be at the beginning of his efforts, at the outer edges of the Light. "In an infinite depth, and in endless heights, who can find the beginning, middle and end? I long always for more, yearning and feeling that it is very much, what I see I desire and feel that I have nothing, without understanding the richness of what has been granted me, not realizing that I see the Sun."⁵¹

Under the shining beams of this Light, the mystic poet contemplates all the great questions of man's existence, and entrusts their solution to it. From it there flows a knowledge and wisdom in comparison to which every other wisdom on earth is foolishness (moria).⁵²

The Wisdom which comes from this Light has an eternal character. It never passes away. To it belongs the certainty of eternity. Through it man becomes aware of his own inner poverty and wretchedness, and knows full well the true meaning of his existence set within the fluidity of time. He observes all that happens in time with eyes enlightened by the eternal values. He sees better and more clearly the image of God which is given to him by God. In the heart of St. Symeon there has occurred a transformation which makes him see everything differently from our manner of seeing things. Thus it is sometimes hard for us to understand

him. His words are "dressed with immaterial clothes."⁵³

From his continuous longing for the Light there flow rivers of tears which cleanse him, to make him like "the pure bread of Christ."⁵⁴

He holds his lighted candle, ready to enter the Feast of the Kingdom. To await the Bridegroom is already to be in His presence. In the Light, past, present and future form an astonishing unity.

5. Who can see the Light and who cannot see it.

The vision of the Light is the most difficult and highest effort of St. Symeon's entire life on earth. Speaking to God he says: "O, I believe in Thee, my God. Save me by shining upon me Divine Light."⁵⁵ "I am thirsty for plenteous waters."⁵⁶

The first conditions for the vision of the Divine Light are a strong Faith, sincere Love and hope in God. Then there is the essential need of man's purification (*katharsis*). Complete purification can only come through repentance, and abandonment of the world. "If you are dressed in your wretched flesh and the intellect does not stand naked, you are covered with darkness and are unable to see the Light."⁵⁷

"Man's purification is incomplete, unless he embraces the fulness of Light."⁵⁸

The Light is always inwardly active, and if a moment should come when man, because of his weakness, cannot bear the holy burden of Light, then "suddenly the Light disappears secretly and like the sun goes in and is hidden and can no more be seen."⁵⁹

When the Light enters the heart, man finds quietness. He who does not see the Divine Light is exposed to the danger of various beasts, which are his passions. These beasts corrode him little by little in his darkened state. When he recognizes the situation in which he finds himself, he cries bitterly. St. Symeon prays to God not to hide from him his Divine Light, for he feels that he will be swallowed by the abyss. He who does not see the Divine Light "because of the comforts of his flesh," or maintains that it is impossible to see it in this present life, is likened to those who deny Holy Scriptures and the whole plan of God.⁶⁰ The Light is like a guardian in this life and he who lacks that guardian "is punished day and night."⁶¹ The evil spirits fall down like leaves⁶² in the shining of the Divine Light. Concern for the material things of this life prevents the shining entrance of the Divine Light. Those

who bind themselves with the things of this world can never see the Light. If man is to receive this "non-material, arrow from a non-material source,"⁶³ the first necessary condition is the awareness of what is eternal and what passes away.⁶⁴ This awareness is acquired by three means: (A) Sorrow for sin, which is the first part of repentance; Compunction.⁶⁵ (B) The practice of silence.⁶⁶ (C) Meditation on death.⁶⁷ Compunction, which he describes as sweeter than any other food or drink, teaches us about the transient and the eternal things of our existence, and separates us from the world. Silence cuts away all the useless roots of the soul, and the meditation on death helps the soul to reach the highest state of humility. When these conditions have been fulfilled, then "What a miracle! One is able to see plainly the Divine Light."⁶⁸

"... Know well," says St. Symeon, "that you are a creature of soul and body, and that you have two eyes, the sensible (*aisthetos*) and the intelligible (*noetos*), just as there are two suns and two lights, the sensible and the intelligible. If man sees only the sensible light, he deprives himself of the spiritual light, being himself dead. The naturally blind man, is unable to do even the smallest tasks, he is (*anenergetos*). Moreover, he who does not see the intelligible Light is dead and even more than dead. The man who is blind to the spiritual Light will die eternally."⁶⁹ The Divine Light is seen through the cooperation of the intelligible sight with the transfigured and spiritualized physical sight. The body has to play its own part. "If the body is to partake with the soul in the ineffable benefits of the world to come, it is certain that it must participate in them now as far as it is possible. For the body, too, has an experience of divine things, when the passionate forces of the soul are not destroyed but transformed and sanctified."⁷⁰

6. The three states of man in relation to the appearing of the Divine Light. Before—During—After.

The history of the man who loves God, in relation to the shining of the Light, can be divided into three stages: before, during and after. Before the shining of the Divine Light, man's existence can be described as a state of misery. He is in a fallen situation and close to the darkness of Hell. Without the shining of the Light man is lost in his ignorance (*agnosia*); he is ignorant both of himself and at the same time of God. This ignorance is real atheism and is a complete state of spiritual blindness. From the lights of this world, he is unable to draw any assistance. The more he focuses on the outside world, the more ignorant he is of God.⁷¹

Ignorance means darkness and deterioration of the spirit, which little by little leads him to the loss of all meaning in his life. Only the appearance of the Divine Light enables man to regain his lost paradise,⁷² because the revelation of the Divine Light signifies the first stirrings in his heart and the first steps on the path to Eternity.

Through the operation of energies of the intelligible sun (*noetos helios*), man becomes like an immaterial star (*aylos phoster*).⁷³ In the moment of the shining of the Divine Light, lonely man succeeds in attaining the highest Good. And in leaving the boundaries of this world, he leaps over the walls of the necessities of this life, and enters the depths of God. In this way he succeeds in knowing and in being known by God:" And in an unexpressible way he is joyful, seeing the unspeakable splendor of his Lord and enjoys with all his heart this Light, the happiness of his Creator."⁷⁴ After this experience, his desire for God becomes still deeper. The moment of the vision of the Divine Light is described as "dreadful beyond words."⁷⁵ When the fire comes to man's substance, which is as weak as straw, it arouses in him unbearable pains.⁷⁶

St. Symeon is overwhelmed by amazement before the miracle of the shining of the Light, and is no longer interested in seeking to comprehend how he sees the Light and where it is to be found. He is filled by spiritual impassibility which is an expression of heavenly Beatitude. During the period of the vision of the Divine Light, he is beyond the limits of the physical world. He describes the Light as "the great Holy" (*trisagion*).⁷⁷ In spite of this, he considers himself, knowing his weakness to be still distant from the invisible beauty of the Light (*atheaton kallos*). Because of this distance the Light "is like a drop in the void. All the waters of every ocean are shown to me as a drop."⁷⁸ To explain the quality and the immensity of what he sees, he uses the image of a piece of cloth. One has to be shown but a small piece of material in order to know the exact nature of an entire bolt of cloth. One needs only to see the toe of a lion to know that it is really the ferocious beast.⁷⁹ Under the shining of the Light, St. Symeon is caught up in twofold fear: not to be burnt by the fire as the wax of a candle, and also, not to lose this wonderful vision from his sight. Sometimes he feels that he is standing behind a door and anxiously beholding the Light through a small hole in it.⁸⁰ The result of the shining of this Light is that the heart is inflamed with desire for God. The being and life of God now dwells in his own spirit.

Although the flame of the Divine Light sears, it does not consume man's soul which is described as being like a substance of straw. But it alters the soul in its flame, as the burning bush flamed before the eyes of Moses. "The fire embraced the soul and was united with it, and at the same time left it without any harm at all."⁸¹ This second state usually is very short. It is the moment of man's communion with the sacramental cup of the Light. The mystic poet remains quite still after the removal of the Divine Light. Then follows a moment of severe trial. Many questions come into his mind: "How can the holy substance of God be mingled with my own weak, straw-like substance? How can it be that I am not burnt? How can it be that my soul remains unaltered and at the same time is quite transfigured. It remains as straw although it has become light."⁸² Although St. Symeon is obliged to talk thus inwardly, yet he ceases. He who has tasted the sweetness of the Divine Light and has seen its unimaginable beauty keeps silence, because from the nature of the Light nothing can be explained (*physei gar atheggta eisin, aneklaeta pante anthropois ta aporreta*).⁸³ When the Divine Light is taken away, St. Symeon finds his body again. He returns into the world. He compares the memory of the wondrous joy which he has experienced with the spiritual desert in which he finds himself in the absence of the Divine Light, and he cries continually "just as the child which longs for the milk of his mother weeps, until he sucks and is satisfied."⁸⁴ He is watching day and night for the reappearance of the Light, like the hunter who lies in wait for his prey. He has forgotten every other care: "As long as it does not appear to me I am without self-control."⁸⁵ The memory feeds him continually in his waiting, for he who has once tasted the Divine Light desires it continually, disdaining the world and rejecting its honours and glories.⁸⁶ This state of profound nostalgia is his constant situation. As if the Hand of God had disappeared once after having been extended to him, he cries: "I was thrown into darkness and fell to the ground crying, rolling, and panting painfully."⁸⁷ The actual circumstances of these three periods—the period of ignorance, the period of the appearance of the Light, and the period of its withdrawal—can be sketched briefly as follows: First, the Light shines in the darkness of ignorance and the intellect is taken up onto the heights. Man is seized with an undefinable sadness because he is possessed by the feeling that he cannot escape entirely from the conditions of his material existence and live entirely in the shining beams of the Light.

Afterwards there follows the time of constant seeking. He searches for it everywhere; in the air, and in the four corners of the earth. He becomes a wanderer, a man without a country, a traveller through the world, seeking what he has lost. The Light reappears many times in different forms in order to test him. For instance, it reappears in the form of a luminous cloud (*photeine nephele*) descending upon his head. At that moment he cries: "Lord have mercy upon me." The cloud disappears and St. Symeon stands there naked, in sorrowful loneliness. Then he turns his gaze inward into the depths of this heart, where he awaits the vision of the star again, and there in the midst of it he often sees it in the form of a sun.⁸⁸

In the third act of the drama of the Light, St. Symeon talking to the Light, speaks as follows: "O Light, I am so full of regret, be merciful to my soul. And be not angered that I desire to speak with you again Reveal to me everything about yourself and send me not away without an answer."⁸⁹ These words of the mystic are considered by the Divine Light as being a daring and foolish act, because he asks about those things which he has already experienced, pretending that he does not know. But in his love of man, the Light of God replies thus to the latter's questionings: "Believe that I show myself in accordance with the capacities of each."⁹⁰ In a hymn,⁹¹ we find the various states of the soul in relation to the appearance of the shining of the Light.

7. The Fruits of the Vision of the Divine Light.

The fruits of the Divine Light extend throughout the whole of the mystical life. From the moment that it becomes man's companion, it accompanies him in all his efforts and in all the adventures of life. The Divine Light is an inexhaustible spring from which there flows every kind of grace, compassion, and mercy.⁹² Through its power the demons are expelled and all timidity as well. Man finds strength and courage when he is clad in the spiritual garment (*noeros chiton*) of the Light. At the same time he separates himself from the material things of the world and joins the invisible powers which are united with God. In the beginning, the sudden appearance melts him, but afterwards it transfigures him and at last makes him a fertile soil in which the fruits of the Holy Ghost are received and planted.⁹³

The removal of the Light has a pedagogic character, to produce a state of humiliation. To reach the highest state of humility and to extinguish man's egoism are essential conditions for the

fertilization of good works and for true fulfillment. Every appearance of the Light nourishes the mystic in various ways, and every visit of it brings rich gifts from the heart of God the Father. The dried soil of the heart is satiated by the gift of the Light to man which communicated to him its own simplicity and kindness.

The Divine Light has also another significant function. It cleanses and purifies the heart, burning out the tares (*zizania*) which the devil has sown in his hatred for man, so that man gains from it consolation and relief. Man alone cannot banish them if the Light does not come to his aid.⁹⁴ The Divine Light expels the passions from the heart one by one. When it shines and "the multitude of passions" are expelled, and the dwelling-place of the heart is purified, then the Light mingles unmixed with it and is united to it in an unspeakable manner . . . The manner in which this mingling takes place, I cannot explain,"⁹⁵ says St. Symeon.

The shining of the Light is a preparation and real training for the future glory of heaven. For this reason man ought to have a continuous contact with it. In order to have this contact with the Divine Light, he must see and hear in a different way than we. His senses must be spiritualized and must have approached a certain degree of fulfillment. He must continually desire spiritual and high things.⁹⁶

Not only the spirit, but the flesh as well is sanctified, "and this flesh shines as the soul."⁹⁷ The Divine Light gives life to man⁹⁸ and he owes his progress to its mercy. The grace of the Divine Light is not something abstract and theoretical. It has practical consequences, too. St. Symeon says: "I cannot tell you of the effects of the Light but I have experienced them in a practical way."⁹⁹ Every possible difficulty which man can experience finds its proper solution through the operation of the Divine Light; in disease, in prison, in disappointment, in famine, in anxiety the Light is present. The darts of evil, the temptation, the burdens of life disappear before the powerful stream of Light and man is kept safe under its wings. The vision of Light, and of its operations are in accordance with man's love, his good intentions and his keeping of God's commandments.¹⁰⁰

Without the Divine Light, as we have already mentioned, man is blind. Whenever his sight is possessed by this Divine Light, he sees everything in light. This union of human sight with the Divine Light cannot be expressed (*aphrastos kai asygchytos*). Man, who was previously blind, is now on his way towards eternal life. He

beholds both the invisible and the visible Creation of God through the Light. The mystic, seeing this Light of God, sees God Himself, who "reveals everything that is good for man's happiness and does it whenever it likes."¹⁰¹ The illuminated man enters the house of the mysteries of God holding the candle of the Divine Light in his hand.

Another energy of the Divine Light is its didactic function, as we have mentioned already. "If you are united with the Divine Light, it will teach you all things, and it will reveal and show you what is good and beneficial for you, because it is impossible for you to learn in other ways, through your own rational faculties, what lies beyond the borders of your understanding."¹⁰²

Man communicates with the Divine Light as if he were going to partake in the glory of God, his face is illuminated and all his members become glowing with Divine Light. Inwardly he is sanctified. He is richer than any rich man on earth, more powerful than any powerful man, greater than Kings and worthier than every other thing on earth or in Heaven.¹⁰³

This presence of the Divine Light living within man speaks to him, illuminates him, sees and is seen by him. This ray of Divinity, which is at the same time both in and out of space and time, is at once in Heaven and in man's heart, and unites him with God. It teaches him continually about the nature and mysteries of God. The same Light explains and answers all questions and exhorts man to the love of his fellow-man. Although St. Symeon often felt his body like a wall around his soul, in reality he was free, so that he did not fear darkness and death. Under the splendor, time took on the aspect of unity. All distinctions were at an end: "day becomes night and night becomes day."¹⁰⁴

8. The Eschatology of the Divine Light.

Through the shining of the Divine Light, the eschatological fulfillment is constantly present. Although man is confined within the limitations of his earthly existence, yet he has begun already to live in the age to come. For this Light which man may see while he is still on earth, is the awkward Light which forms the ground beneath the feet of the saints.¹⁰⁵

It is impossible for man, unless he has already seen and experienced this Light during his earthly existence, to enjoy its radiance in the life to come.¹⁰⁶ Only those who have already been united with it here below¹⁰⁷ will be enabled to participate in the

eternal glory of God. Those who lack this Divine Light when they die, will be covered by darkness in all eternity: "In vain some of them hope that even though they have not seen it here, they will see it afterwards."¹⁰⁸ This is because the pledge of eternal life must be sealed already here on earth.¹⁰⁹ But, of course the Divine Light continues its work in us after this life. St. Symeon describes it as "the travelling companion of the soul" along the whole of the way of its return to God: "With it and through it we shall come before you, O Saviour."¹¹⁰ Under its protection, man will be able to pass through armies of evil powers without suffering harm.¹¹¹ It clothes him also, so that his sins and impurities are invisible to the angels, so that they will not be offended.¹¹²

The indwelling of the Divine Light which takes place in a few holy souls constitutes a manifestation of the parousia which has begun in them already. They did not allow even a minute of their life here on earth to be lost; already here below they began to enjoy the inaccessible Light of God. And now and for ever they are in God, in and by the same Light. They have overcome the darkness and dominion of death. For them, the judgement of salvation in time has come, and they have been found ready, pure and full of love before the Light, from whose rays there is nothing that can be hidden. Those who have not acquired this Divine Light, and have not seen it because of their indifference and their unrepentance, will be excluded forever from the vision of this Divine Light, which here on earth was continually knocking at their door.

According to the state in which it is found at the last day, each soul will be clothed with a garment either of Light or of darkness. Those whose candles are found to be already alight, like those of the wise virgins, will be able to enter into the feast of the Kingdom. Those on the other hand whose candles, like those of the foolish virgins, are found without light, will enter once and for all into the darkness in which no spark of light shines.¹¹³

The bodies both of the just and of the unjust decay when they die. At the resurrection of the dead, all will be resurrected according as they have sown.¹¹⁴ The bodies of the sinners will be resurrected unclean, stinking, full of corruption and darkness. And they will be united with the evil demons whose mind and suggestions and work they have followed. The bodies of the saints, on the other hand, will be resurrected in glory, the glory of the

Divine Light in which they lived. And the souls which have dwelt in such pure bodies will shine more than the sun.¹¹⁵

UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS
ATHENS, GREECE

FOOTNOTES

1. A non-critical edition of the Hymns, known as that of Dionysios Zagoraios, appeared in Venice in 1790 (second part, pp. 1-131); a second edition with many errors and misinterpretations was issued in Syros, in 1886 (second part, pp. 1-84). From that edition an offset edition was made in Athens in 1959. The Zagoraios edition omits four Hymns of which two (Nr. 10 and Nr. 15 vv. 141-264) were published with a commentary by Paul Maas, "Aus der Poesie des Mystikers Symeon," in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der Byzantinischen Literatur* (Bonn and Leipzig, 1922) pp. 335-40.

Another study would be needed to examine the relationship between St. Symeon's teaching about the Light and that of earlier Church Fathers and Writers. As we have mentioned already, this paper examines St. Symeon's teaching about the Light as it is found in his poetry. There were no doubt various influences on St. Symeon, especially the teaching of his spiritual Father; but it is nevertheless obvious that he speaks from his personal experiences, and he expresses his own dialogue with the Divine Light. The excellent book, *Essai sur la Théologie Mystique de l'Eglise d'Orient* by Vladimir Lossky, contains a very interesting chapter on the "Divine Light" (English edition, London, 1957, pp. 217-35), in which the subject is examined from the standpoint of the teaching of the Eastern Church Fathers.

The Light in the life of the Eastern Church is the main expression of joyfulness. The icons of the saints are surrounded by a halo of Light, and the church is full of candles and lamps. Behind the altar is a lamp which is lit from the Resurrection Light of Eastern Sunday. Everyone who enters the church lights a candle, which symbolizes the driving of the soul into the presence of God. In the Hymnology the liturgical and sacramental life of the church we often meet the Light which expresses the glory and the innermost beatitude of the believers. For instance, in the Sacrament of Baptism, the priest on beholding the baby says:

"Grant me a luminous robe, my Lord, you Who are surrounded by Lights" and the white clothes in which the child is dressed are called luminous clothes (*photikia*).

The triumphant presence of the Light can be seen a few moments before the Resurrection celebration of Easter Sunday: the Church is in darkness, all is still and all are expectantly waiting for the rising of the Sun. At this moment, the priest comes out through the Royal Gate with his candle alight saying: "Come and take Light from the Light which knows no setting." The Light is passed on from one member of the congregation to the other. "Everything is filled with Light; the heavens, the earth and hell," says an Easter Day hymn.

Each one beholds his Light and is ready to sing the most triumphant hymn: "Christ is risen . . ." The words of the priest: "Come and take Light," could be a fitting title to St. Symeon's Hymns.

In 1969, there was published in Paris and in the series of **Sources Chrétiennes** the first volume of Symeon's Hymns (Nr. 156, Hymns 1-15). In 1971, the second volume (Nr. 174, Hymns 16-40 and in 1973, the third volume (Nr. 196, Hymns 41-58) were published. The references of this article are to this critical edition.

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-----|----------------------|
| 2. | 52, 6 | | |
| 3. | John 12: 46 | | |
| 4. | James 1: 17 | | |
| 5. | 1 Peter 2: 9 | 27. | 22, 174 |
| 6. | 2 Corinthians 4: 6 | 28. | 28, 114 |
| 7. | 35, 59-60 | 29. | 22, 180-184 |
| 8. | 34, 57 and 29, 205 | 30. | 25, 10 |
| 9. | 45, 6 | 31. | 1, 38-40 |
| 10. | 30, 145-159 | 32. | 23, 237 |
| 11. | 18, 41 | 33. | 23, 243 |
| 12. | 52, 6 | 34. | 23, 254-255 |
| 13. | 34, 78 | 35. | 23, 268 |
| 14. | 18, 42 | 36. | 23, 372-377 |
| 15. | 24, 29 | 37. | 18, 67-68 |
| 16. | 12, 47 | 38. | 18, 71-73 |
| 17. | 1, 36 | 39. | 23, 149 |
| 18. | 22, 159-164 | 40. | 30, 78-80 |
| 19. | 22, 161 | 41. | 30, 152-161 |
| 20. | 47, 3 | 42. | 30, 427-428 |
| 21. | 39, 19 | 43. | 23, 292-294 |
| 22. | Hebrew 13: 14 | 44. | 28, 114-117 |
| 23. | 50, 44-46 | 45. | 12, 19-22 |
| 24. | 50, 51 | 46. | 12, 23-24 |
| 25. | 50, 53 | 47. | 11, 35-36 |
| 26. | 50, 50 | 48. | 11, 39 and 37, 22-24 |

49. 8, 4-5
50. 45, 1-3
51. 44-52
52. A Cor. 3, 19
53. 13, 7
54. Ignatios, Rom. IV, 1
55. 26, 100
56. 3, 10
57. 15, 235-237
58. 8, 39-40
59. 55, 128-129
60. 45, 80-85
61. 33, 32
62. 33, 42
63. 5, 21
64. 10, 8-11 and 5, 17
65. 5, 16
66. 5, 18
67. 5, 19
68. 5, 21
69. 23, 448-470
70. see Hagioritic Tome, PG 150, 1233
BD; Lossky, *op. cit.* pp. 224-225.
71. 28, 24-26
72. 30, 208-214
73. 49, 74-78
74. 49, 25-26
75. 13, 59
76. 24, 25-26
77. 11, 38
78. 11, 59
79. 11, 62-63
80. 11, 71
81. 28, 156
82. 28, 160-167
83. 22, 205-206
84. 24, 89-91
85. 16, 10
86. 8, 84-90
87. 50, 99-100
88. 17, 385-386
89. 22, 5-29
90. 22, 163
91. 13, 1-10
92. 22, 180ff
93. Galatians 5: 22
94. 18, 51-53
95. 30, 152-162
96. 39, 56-62
97. 50, 244-245
98. 51, 1
99. 51, 3-4
100. 29, 209-213
101. 29, 206-208
102. 30, 601-607
103. 16, 31-38
104. 18, 110
105. 27, 81-82
106. 42, 134-135
107. 42, 131ff
108. 1, 71-72
109. 1, 73
110. 49, 97-99
111. 42, 103
112. 49, 102, 104
113. 50, 302
114. 50, 305
115. 50, 309-314

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

"THE ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY" OF DIONYSIOS THE AREOPAGITE: A LITURGICAL INTERPRETATION

By **GEORGE S. BEBIS**

I

Contemporary Orthodox scholars have drawn our attention to the great value of the mystical and liturgical theology of the East.¹ The depth of Orthodox Theology cannot be comprehended unless the importance and perennial relevance of this mystical and liturgical theology is grasped.

We offer this short study of the thought of Dionysios the Areopagite as a recognition not only of the author of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* but also of the perennial message of the Orthodox mystical tradition which is indeed the heart of all Orthodox Theology. We believe that the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Dionysios the Areopagite is most interesting today when liturgical reforms have become imperative and when today's youth turn towards pseudo-mystical liturgical experiences in order to gratify their spiritual craving.

Although one of the most neglected works of the *Corpus Areopagiticum*, the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* deserves close study. It presents an important picture of the liturgical life of ancient times. At the same time it introduces us into a profoundly mystical interpretation of symbolism. It presents us with a most interesting theology of symbolism.

II

The problem of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* and the identity of Dionysios are not examined here.² That the *Corpus Areopagiticum* is not the work of Dionysios the Areopagite who was converted to Christianity by St. Paul (Acts 17:34) is not disputed any more. The author still remains a mystery. No attempt to identify the author with various prominent personalities of the early Christian era has produced successful results. There is general agreement today that the most probable date of the Pseudo-Dionysian work is between the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the

sixth. The **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy** then expresses the liturgical spirit and practice of the fifth and sixth centuries.³ As far as the geographical origin of this work is concerned, we may assume that it belongs to the Syrian rite, although it is quite difficult to prove the authenticity of this claim.⁴

III

This study will concentrate on the liturgy or synaxis as it is presented in the **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, since all the other sacraments and ecclesiastical ceremonies are centered around the Eucharist as the core of the liturgical life of the Church. It is indeed interesting to note that the author of the **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy** calls the liturgy *mysterion synaxeos eitoun koinonias*. The terms *synaxis* and *koinonia* are significant because they give us immediately the proper liturgical perspective through which the author writes his Liturgy. The term *synaxis* means the gathering of the people of God to a certain place or *epi to auto* to use the language of St. Ignatios of Antioch.⁵ Pachymeris, the Byzantine scholar and historian of the thirteenth century, in commenting upon the term *synaxis* asserts that the word refers not so much to the gathering of the faithful in a common place but rather to the union of the people with God.⁶ Pachymeris' interpretation is perhaps overly abstracted. *Synaxis* can include both the gathering of the faithful in order to be united among themselves in the common table of the Eucharist and further the union of the faithful with God Himself.⁷ The use of the term *koinonia* strengthens this concept. Through *koinonia* or holy communion man is united both with God and with his fellow men.

The *synaxis* has a specific order. It starts with a "reverent prayer." Pachymeris assumes that this prayer is to *eulogeton*. But we cannot be sure. The *Eulogemene he Vasileia tou Patros* (Blessed is the Kingdom of the Father) with which most of the later liturgies begin is mentioned explicitly for the first time by St. Theodore the Studite.⁸

Who is the celebrant? "The hierarch" according to Dionysios the Areopagite. And who is the hierarch? The bishop who has absolute spiritual authority to preside in the liturgy and to direct the people of God towards the divine mysteries of the Eucharist. After this "reverent prayer" the hierarch censures the whole Church. Actually we have here for the first time mention of censuring as a preliminary act to the liturgy and it seems certain that

before 600 A.D. censuring as a liturgical act had prevailed in the East.⁹

The bishop, after the censuring, returns to the altar and "begins the sacred chanting of the Psalms—the whole 'ecclesiastical order' chanting with him the sacred language of the Psalter."¹⁰ It is obvious from this description that the *enarxis* or the beginning of the liturgy consisted of readings and chantings of the Psalms. But what does the author mean when he uses the expression "ecclesiastical order?"¹¹ There is the possibility of interpreting this from our perspective to mean the clergy or even the semi-clerical orders which abounded in the early Church. But the inclusion of the laity is imperative in view of the fact that both clergy and laity were integral parts of the people of God in the early Church.¹²

After the chanting of the Psalms the reading of the lessons takes place. Maximus the Confessor interprets the phrase, *he ton hagiographon delton anagnosis*, as the reading from the Old and New Testaments.¹³ Following the readings of the lessons, the catechumens, the "*energoumenoi*"¹⁴ and the penitents leave the Church. Some of the *leitourgoi*¹⁵ stand close to the gates of the sanctuary which are now closed.¹⁶ Immediately the deacons and priests place upon the holy altar the bread and the cup with the wine. Then all the congregation sings the *katholike hymnologia*.¹⁷ A prayer follows by the bishop and the proclamation of peace to all. Also the kiss of love. Then the bishop reads secretly the diptychs.¹⁸ The bishop and the priests wash their hands with water.¹⁹ The bishop standing in the middle of the *ekkritoi*²⁰ proceeds with the consecration of the gifts. Here the author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* does not elaborate on the procedure of the consecrating prayer but from the comments of the following chapter on *Theoria* one might reconstruct the main parts of the consecration.

There was a general thanksgiving prayer in which the bishop would recall all the benefits which mankind had received from God up to the time of the coming of Christ whose sufferings were remembered together with the *anamnesis* of the Last Supper and the words of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. The elevation of the bread as well as the fraction probably took place immediately after the ceremony of the consecration. The gifts were uncovered before the consecration and were covered after it, remaining covered until the communion.²¹ The communion of the consecrated gifts followed in which all the clergy participated

while the bishop exhorted the laity to participate in the sacrament. A thanksgiving prayer seems to conclude the Pseudo-Dionysian synaxis.

A comparative outline of the synaxis of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy with its most similar liturgies, namely that of the Apostolic Constitutions²² and of the Mystical Catechesis of St. Cyril of Jerusalem,²³ seems useful at this point.

Dionysios the
Areopagite,
Ecclesiastical Hierarchy
c. 500 A.D.

St. Cyril of
Jerusalem,
Mystical Catecheses
c. 386

**Apostolic
Constitutions,**
Book VIII
c. 350-400

SYNAXIS

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Prayer at the altar | Reading of the O.T. and the N. T. lessons. |
| 2. Incense of the whole church building and the people. | Sermons
Liturgy of the Catechumens.
Liturgy of the Faithful |
| 3. Chanting of Psalms | Prayers. |
| 4. Reading of the O.T. and N.T. lessons | Kiss of peace |
| 5. Departure of the catechumens, energoumenoi and the penitents. | Anaphora
Sanctus
Anamnesis |
| 6. Offering or proskomede of the elements on the altar. | Words of Institution
Epiklesis
Diptycha |
| 7. Katholike Hymnologia | Petitions by the deacon |
| 8. Prayer, Peace to all, kiss of love. | Sancta Sanctis
Communion |
| 9. Diptychs | Thanksgiving |
| 10. Washing of the hands . . . Washing of the hands | |
| 11. Consecration and fraction of the bread. | Kiss of peace
Thanksgiving
Sanctus |

**Dionysios the
Areopagite,
Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**
c. 500 A.D.

**St. Cyril of
Jerusalem,
Mystical Catecheses**
c. 386

**Apostolic
Constitutions,
Book VIII**
c. 350-400

- | | |
|--|---|
| 12. Communion by the
clergy and the people. | Consecration
(Epiklesis) |
| 13. Thanksgiving. | Diptychs for
the living and
the dead.
Our Father . . .
Elevation of the
elements or
Sancta Sanctis
Communion |

A study of these texts shows the Pseudo-Dionysian *synaxis* as simpler in form than the earlier texts of St. Cyril and of the Apostolic Constitutions. Does this mean that the Dionysian text is an earlier one? There is no doubt that the liturgy of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy presents an underdeveloped form of the Eucharistic ceremony.

We must, however, emphasize the simplicity of this *synaxis*. The real value, as we shall see later, of the eucharistic sacrament lies in the mystical depth and the symbolic perspective of the whole rite. The study of its historical and practical content and of its application is useful today. At issue is not the simplistic question of whether or not we should return to a less evolved form of the eucharistic sacrament. Facing the realities of our contemporary society, the Church could make accommodations for special groups such as workers or young people. Special *synaxeis* are possible. The Pseudo-Dionysian text and similar ones can serve as guides and prototypes. The "Great and Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church" has the right to study this important matter and to make decisions in the near future.

IV

The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of the Pseudo-Dionysian Corpus may be considered as the attempt of an early author to interpret and explain the liturgical life of the Church in a mystical manner.

Is this a sign that the faithful of the author's era were already out of touch with the historical and practical meaning and purposes of the liturgical life of the Church? The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy is precisely the attempt to bring the early Christian faithful to a higher awareness of the meaning of the Church, to a more profound and rewarding participation in the Divine Life through worship.

We begin therefore our study of the material of this work by bringing into focus the mystical interpretation of the liturgy and its theological basis.

First of all, Christ Himself is "the supreme Divine Power of every hierarchy and sanctification and divine operation."²⁴ Thus our author opens up the way for the exposition of his mystical theology by establishing from the very beginning that everything in fact comes from Jesus Christ. Actually Christ Himself bequeathes the power of the Divine Priesthood from which, by approaching the holy exercise of the priestly office, we become nearer to the Being above us by assimilation, according to our power, to the stability and unchangeableness of our steadfastness in holy things. Hence by looking upwards to the blessed and supremely Divine Glory of Jesus and reverently gazing upon whatever we are permitted to see and being illuminated with the knowledge of the visions, we shall be able to become, as regards the science of Divine mysteries, both purified and purifying-images of Light, workers with God, perfect and perfecting.²⁵

The christological basis of the priesthood and the absolute need of this priesthood (called "divine" by the author) for our personal illumination, purification, and finally assimilation to and union with God, are obvious here. But there is another point of great significance—the connection between the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and the Celestial Hierarchy. Both derive from the Supreme Source of all Life. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in particular "has one and the same power throughout the whole of its hierarchical functions, and (that) the hierarch himself according to his nature and aptitude and rank is initiated in divine things and deifies and imparts to his subordinates according to the meekness the sacred deification which comes to himself from God."²⁶

The divine character of the priesthood and its divine origin is emphatically stressed. The term initiation for all the priestly functionaries is significant. It is the attempt to denote a completely new orientation for the future priest.

The Celestial Hierarchy of course is "intellectual" and "supermundane" (noete kai hyperkosmios hestin). In contrast, the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy "conformable to our nature, abounds in a manifold variety of material symbols from which, in proportion to our capacity, we are conducted by sacerdotal function to the one-like deification, assimilation to God and the Divine Virtue."²⁷ So the author is a practical man and he wants to make clear his point that the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, the priesthood on earth needs "material symbols" in order to exercise its duties. Symbolism therefore has a practical purpose and it accords with our human nature.

But one question naturally arises. Namely what is the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of which the author so aptly speaks? "Our Hierarchy is the systematic account of the whole sacred rites included in it (and) according to which the divine Hierarch, being initiated, will have within himself the participation of the most sacred thing as chief of (the) Hierarchy."²⁸

And even more precisely the author assures us that "as he who speaks of (the) Hierarchy speaks of (the) order of the whole sacred rites collectively so he who mentions (the) Hierarch denotes an inspired and godly man, one who understands accurately all sacred knowledge, in whom is completed and recognized in his purity the whole Hierarchy."²⁹

Thus, the earthly basis of the role of the hierarchy is maintained, the collective mission of the clergy is established, the whole range of the Christian sacraments is embraced and the deifying purpose of the whole hierarchy is again expounded. This last point is made clear when the author again writes: "Deification is the assimilation and oneness towards God as far as permissible. Now this is the common love of every Hierarchy—the clinging love towards God and Divine things; a love divinely sanctified into oneness with Him."³⁰

But then what is the main difference between the Celestial and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchies? It is apparent that God has used for the Celestial Hierarchy immaterial and intellectual means whereas for our own Ecclesiastical Hierarchy God has provided the *theoparadota logia*, the God-given words, "in a variety and multitude of divisible symbols as we are able to receive them."³¹

In fact these "God-given words" were given from our inspired initiators, *entheon hieroteleston*, in divinely written letters of the Word of God. It seems that Dionysios refers here to the Old and

New Testaments. For Dionysios the very essence of our Hierarchy is these "God-given words."³² Besides these written words there is also oral tradition which was transmitted from mind to mind through the medium of speech.³³ But we must remember that our hierarchs transmit these things not in clear and understandable means but in sacred symbols.³⁴ The whole concept of *disciplina arcani* or the discipline of secrecy comes to mind³⁵ and more especially St. Basil's unwritten, unpublished or secret tradition.³⁶

Then the author of the *Corpus Areopagiticum* proceeds to the special orders or the sacred orders which are within the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. These orders are in fact threefold and are arranged "as first, middle, and last in rank, each carefully guarding the proportion of religious rites, and the well-ordered fellowship which keeps in harmonious order and binds all things together."³⁷

The sacerdotal order is also divided in the following way into three parts: "into a purifying, and illuminating, and perfecting discipline."³⁸ The first of the sacred or contemplative orders is the divine order of the hierarchs or bishops. The hierarchs are those who work for the perfection of all things in the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. As Jesus Christ is the model of both the Ecclesiastical and the Celestial Hierarchies so all the orders have their ultimate authority in the office of the hierarch. He is "the power of the hierarchical order (which) permeates the whole sacred body and through every one of the sacred orders performs the mysteries of its proper hierarchy."³⁹

The hierarch has the right and the privilege to perform most of the services in the Sanctuary. In fact, the priest can do nothing unless he is designated, *kekleromenos*, by the hierarch. The latter can perform ordination, the consecration of the divine Myron, and the complete consecration of the altar. The "perfecting faculty" is given to the hierarchs.⁴⁰

The order of priests is the "illuminating order" (*photagogike taxis*).⁴¹

They conduct and advise the initiated and co-operate with the hierarch in the sacraments. The "*leitourgoi*" or the deacons are the "purifying order." They separate the unfit before the liturgy and "purify those (who) are drawing nigh, making them entirely pure from opposing fashions, and suitable for the sanctifying vision and communion."⁴²

The deacons help those who are to become Christians to renounce their former life, and they teach them the new way of

life. This function is expressed symbolically at the sacrament of Baptism by the assistance they give in removing the candidate's clothing.

The author reminds us that the practical functions of the sacred orders are in reality images of the Divine Energies and therefore are arranged "in hierarchical distinctions showing in themselves the regulated illuminations into the first, middle, and last sacred energies and orders of the well regulated and unconfused order of Divine Energies."⁴³

The intent of the analogy becomes most clear when the author states that the hierarchical image follows in its threefold division the Supreme Diety Himself Who first cleanses the minds which He enters, then enlightens, and when enlightened brings them to a Godlike perfection.⁴⁴

The ceremonies of ordination of the three ranks of the hierarchy are described by the author in only a few words. The same procedure is followed for the three ranks: the procession to the altar, kneeling, the imposition of the hierarch's right hand, the cruciform seal, the announcement of the name, and the completion of the salutation.⁴⁵

Behind all these acts there is a mystical meaning. The procession, for instance, to the altar together with the kneeling, suggests that the ordained person places his life, his "whole intellectual self" under God, Who is the real Author of the consecration, and approaches Him pure and hallowed. The imposition of the hierarch's right hand signifies the protection of the Primal Consecrator by Whom, as holy children, they are cherished paternally. It gives them at the same time, (the sacerdotal habit and function) and drives away the opposing power.⁴⁶ The sign of the cross has its own symbolic meaning; it signifies and manifests the inaction of the impulses of the flesh. The calling aloud of the name of the ordained signifies that his choice was made by God Himself and not by the hierarch. The salutation (kiss) points to the mutual love among those who are in the same rank and also the religious communion of minds of like character.⁴⁷ Finally the author presents a mystical interpretation for each distinctive mark of the ordination of each rank. On the future hierarch's head the Gospels are placed, signifying that through his office, he leads those who have been purified by the deacons and enlightened by the priests to the knowledge which makes perfect the new Christians.⁴⁸

V

So much for the sacred order of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. What of the mystical and symbolic meaning of the sacraments of baptism and of chrism? Here the author has many things to say. First for the author: "the earliest approach towards the religious performance of the Divine Commandments is the unutterable creation of our being in God."⁴⁹ We must be taught the way we are going to obtain our "regeneration." Actually the center of illumination is the union with Christ "like as by fire to assimilate things that have been made one, in proportion to their aptitude of deification."⁵⁰

Union with Christ therefore and deification are the ultimate goals of baptism. The rite of baptism follows the well-known traditional line: Thanksgiving by the hierarch, hymn sung by the whole body of the Church, confession by the future Christian, imposition of the hierarch's hand upon his head, and his registration and that of his sponsor by the priests. After a prayer the deacons remove from the baptized his old clothes and sandals. He turns to the west and renounces Satan three times and once again recites his confession three times. The priest anoints his entire body with the oil while the bishop dedicates the water by sacred invocation and consecrates it by three cruciform affusions of Holy Myron. Baptism then follows whereupon the bishop immerses the baptized into the water three times invoking the name of the Holy Trinity. Then he is clothed and is anointed with chrism by the bishop after which he receives, for the first time, Holy Communion.⁵¹

There is much beauty and profound meaning behind the simple but very impressive acts. The author writes: "This initiation of the holy birth in God, as in symbols, has nothing unbecoming or irreverent, not anything of sensible imagery, but enigmas of a contemplation worthy of God, bearing a likeness to natural images suitable to men."⁵²

At this point Dionysios feels that it would be relevant to clear up any misunderstanding which could arise from the manner and method of his interpretation. He writes: "Sensible sacred things are reliefs of things intelligible to which they lead and show the way. But things intelligible are archetype and explanation of sacred things cognizable by the senses."⁵³

Thus having explained his method: the philosophical and

theological basis upon which he builds his interpretation, the author proceeds to the mystical meaning of baptism. The bishop's seal upon the initiated is a sign or symbol of the divine blessedness which imparts to him divine light and makes him a godly sharer of the inheritance and of the sacred order of godly men. The neophyte's registration (as well as that of his sponsor) by the priests is a sign that he belongs to those who are in the process of salvation. The holy anointing and the holy oil prepare the neophyte in his struggle against death and destruction and build him up into a victorious athlete who can support his freedom and his spiritual strength against death and destruction.⁵⁴ The three immersions in the water symbolize the three days and nights which Christ spent in the tomb.⁵⁵ The white garments are the light which his image should always reflect.⁵⁶ The most perfecting unction or the myrrh makes the neophyte a person of "good odor" of good fragrance.⁵⁷ It gives to him also the indwelling of the supremely Divine Spirit.⁵⁸

VI

We come now to the part of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy which is most important for this present study: the synaxis and holy communion.

Earlier we discussed the form and the order of the synaxis.⁵⁹ Let us look now at the mystical interpretation our author gives us. First of all the general and peaceful distribution of one and same Bread and of one and the same Cup signifies a fellowship in spirit, and the provision of spiritual nourishment for the faithful. It is a memorial of the Mystical Supper of our Lord. Thus, the synaxis has a unique, simple, and proscribed origin. Liturgically, it is multiplied into a holy variety of symbols and allows us to travel through the whole range of divine imagery.⁶⁰ Our author deals specifically with these.

The singing of the Psalms for instance signifies the harmonious condition of our souls during the celebration of the mystery. Contemplating on the scripture readings, the congregated are inspired as "being moved by the One Supremely Divine Spirit."⁶¹ The reading of the diptychs and the kiss of peace symbolize the unity of all the faithful "for it is not possible to be collected to the One and to partake of the peaceful Oneness of the One when people are divided among themselves."⁶² The reading of diptychs also signifies the inseparable conjunction of the Celestial and the Ecclesiastical orders in Christ our Lord.⁶³ With the washing of the

hands the hierarch is made like Christ clean and spotless⁶⁴ and consecrates and distributes the "divine symbols" as Christ did Himself at the Last Supper.⁶⁵ The breaking of the Bread and the distribution of the Cup are acts according to which "he symbolically multiplies and distributes the unity completing in these a most holy divine Service."⁶⁶ By bringing the veiled gifts to view, the bishop brings forth Christ from the "hiddenness of the Father."⁶⁷ With the distribution of the gifts to all the faithful, Christ calls them into communion with Himself and His own good things.

Dionysios' mystical interpretation of the Eucharist is a magnificent one. His symbolism directs our attention to a higher reality. It is a focus on that around which the whole life of the faithful must move and develop.

Our author goes on to the deep mystical meaning of the whole Christian life. He deals with the life of the monks. The sacred order of monks is made up of men who must live a life of purification. Monks in fact have acquired a spiritual ascent to contemplation and the participation in every divine Service.⁶⁸ There is a special ceremony for the consecration of the monk which is very simple. The candidate kneels and the hierarch imposes his hand. The priest blesses him and makes the sign of the cross upon him and crops his hair.

VIII

Some conclusions should be drawn at the end of this study. First, the **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy** is one of the most important liturgical texts of the early Christian period, and it introduces us, in a rather simple way, to the liturgical life and **praxis** of the Church of the fifth and sixth centuries. It expresses the liturgical **ethos** of the Syrian rite. It includes primitive elements from the life of the early Church, yet it shows us the tendency of that time for further elaboration of the liturgical life. However, the author's primary concern is not so much with an exact description of the liturgical ceremonies of his time or of this land. His purpose is not to offer a complete and detailed liturgical text. Rather it is to present to his reader a commentary on, and an interpretation of the liturgical life of his time. His approach is philosophical, theological, and mystical. Dionysios is a profound thinker, a possessor of an excellent philosophical education. His sharp mind and his mystical intuition are inter-mingled to provide for a grasp of the more inward plane of the spiritual life. He succeeds in

transforming texts, words, and ceremonies into an abiding source of inspiration for all the faithful. Young people of today would find in him an endless source of pure Christian mysticism and the flames of his spirituality can touch and move many cynical hearts of our time. He links the Celestial and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchies admirably into the Supreme and Absolute Oneness of Christ and establishes a common source and a common goal of both Heavenly and earthly beings. He walks on the earth, so to speak, but he flies in heaven with an astonishing assurance, with wholesome faith and sincere love. His analogies and parallelisms are instructive even to our more practical minds. Thus the role of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, though symbolically stated is clearly defined: "For thus our Hierarchy, reverently arranged in ranks fixed by God, is the Heavenly Hierarchy, preserving, so far as man can do, its Godlike characteristics and Divine imitation."⁷⁵

Parker claims that he has traced Platonic influence in the language and the context of the Dionysian text. Now the Platonic influence on Dionysios has become a subject of disputes and controversies. There is no doubt that he used Neo-Platonic sources, as Father Florovsky has already stated,⁷⁶ and sometimes this extensive use of Neo-Platonic sources and language is an impediment in making his thought clear. But there is no doubt that he remains a Christian theologian as both Father Florovsky⁷⁷ and Vladimir Lossky⁷⁸ have proved. One must also remember that he succeeds in transforming Neo-Platonic terminology into Christian vocabulary. The use of words like *teleosis*, *catharsis*, *theourgia*, *noete*, *theorea*, *meesis*, *archetypon*, *enosis*, *methexis*, were in use as philosophical terms of his times and there is no doubt that Dionysios, whoever he may be, succeeded in Christianizing this Greek terminology.

In studying the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in particular and the whole *Corpus Areopagiticum* in general, one can see that Dionysios' main concern is the union of man with God. This union is a complete union, a perfect participation in the Divine Energies of God and this is the basic *substratum* as well as the ultimate goal of Dionysios' mystical theology. How can we reach this perfect union? Through the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, the author answers: Here precisely lies the center around which the Christian sacraments move. Nonetheless, he is conscious of the dangers which might spring out of this thesis. Therefore he is ready to proclaim that "if we aspire to communion with Him, we must keep our eyes fixed upon His most godly life in the flesh, and we

must retrace our path to the Godlike and blameless habit of mind by being made like it in holy sinlessness. For thus He will communicate to us an harmonious likeness to Himself."⁷⁹

Dionysios seems to be a Christ-centered man and a man who knows the necessity of combining Divine Grace and human efforts in the attainment of deification. But above all Dionysios' contribution to Christian thought is found mainly in his mystical approach and intuition which are expressed in the whole spectrum of his theology and in introducing the mystical interpretation into the sphere of the liturgical life of the Church.

Dionysios, the unknown author, remains one of the outstanding theologians of the early Church. Through the breath of a sincere and profound mystical theology, he offers us an insight into the hierarchical structure of all human life and of the whole cosmos; that, in fact, the common denominator in all stratas of life is divine. His *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* proves his awareness of the need for order in all expressions of life. The liturgical praxis of the Church is a necessary part of his work.

But for contemporary man his message is more sound and clear: He shows us that only through a pure and simple liturgical experience can we attain our ultimate goal—perfection.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Georges Florovsky's very interesting and informative article on Dionysios the Areopagite in the *Threskeutike kai Ethike Egkyklopaideia*, XII (1968), 473-80.
2. For a complete bibliography on Dionysios see *ibid.*, p. 480; *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, pp. 1075-1121; and B. Altaner, *Patrology* (Edinburgh and London, 1960), pp. 604-09.
3. G. Florovsky, *Egkyklopaideia*; J. Tixeront, *A Handbook of Patrology* (St. Louis and London, 1943), p. 289; and J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Bonn, 1938), p. 275.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 275 and G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Glasgow, 1954), p. 445.
5. *Letter to the Ephesians*, ch. 5.
6. *PG*, III, 452.
7. At least this appears to be the conclusion of Dionysios' introduction to the Synaxis and Pachymeris himself; *PG*, III, 421 and 452.
8. In his "Hermenia tes Leitourgias ton Proegiasmenon," *PG*, XCIX, 1690.
9. Dix, *Liturgy*, pp. 444-46.
10. *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, III, 2. We use the translation of J. Parker, *The Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Dionysios the Areopagite* (London, 1894).
11. The Greek expression is *ekklesiastike diakosmesis* which more precisely means "ecclesiastical ornamentation" or "decoration."
12. St. Ignatios, *Letter to the Ephesians*, ch. 5, 9, 13. Cf. also *Letter to Magnesians*, ch. 4, 6, 7.
13. *PG*, IV, 136B.
14. *Energoumenoi*, i.e. those who are annoyed by demons. Cf. also *Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII, 7, 9 and Maximos the Confessor, *PG*, IV, 136B.
15. The term *leitourgoi* is explained by Maximos the Confessor as being the deacons and the sub-deacons. *Ibid.*, Pachymeris refers only to the sub-deacons; *PG*, 3, 452D.
16. *Para tas tou hierou pelas sigkekkeis menas*. It seems that the word *hierou* means sanctuary, at least if one looks at the text superficially. But gates were not in existence at that time, since the *iconostasion* in the present form had not been developed yet. We are inclined to believe that the author refers to the gates of the whole church building.
17. It has been assumed that this *katholike hymnologia* was actually the Creed. Maximos the Confessor (*PG*, IV, 136) and Pachymeris (*PG*, III, 352) accept this interpretation. Later, however, it was assumed that it

was a hymn or the ektenis recited by the deacon or even the Doxology. Metropolitan Athenagoras thinks that **Katholike hymnologia** is in reality nothing less but a form of Doxology as it is found in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions. See Metropolitan Athenagoras, "Hen leitourgikon provlema," **Ekklesiastikos Pharos**, XXXII (1933), pp. 9-51.

18. As we see here the diptychs were read before the consecration, a custom **which** was not prevalent in the East before the 4th century. Cf. G. Dix, **Liturgy**, p. 498, and P. Trembelas, **Hoi Treis Leitourgiai** (Athens, 1935), p. 117.
19. Cf. for comments and interpretation of Dionysios in **Theoria**, ch. 3. It symbolizes the cleansing which should be the characteristic act of the clergy's whole life.
20. Maximos explains that these are the deacons. He also refers to the custom in Rome according to which seven deacons only should participate in the liturgy. (PG, IV, 136). Here we have the Offering or **proskomede** and the Great Entrance. All are combined in one act.
21. Cf. Maximos the Confessor, **Scholia**, PG, 4, 137A.
22. The text in Quasten, **Monumenta eucharistica**.
23. The text edited by Frank Cross, **St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments** (London, 1951), p. 26ff.
24. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, I, 1.
25. **Ibid.**
26. **Ibid.**
27. **Ibid.**
28. **Ibid.**, I, 111.
29. **Ibid.**
30. **Ibid.**
31. **Ibid.**, I, IV. Parker (**Hierarchy**, p. 52) translates the word **logia** as oracles. We do not feel that this translation is accurate.
32. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, I, IV.
33. Cf. Maximos the Confessor, PG, 4, 120-21.
34. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy** I, IV.
35. Cf. my paper: "The concept of Tradition in the Fathers of the Church" in **Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, XV (1970).
36. **On the Holy Spirit**, ch. 27.
37. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, V, ch. 2.
38. **Ibid.**, V, 3.
39. **Ibid.**, V, 5.
40. **Ibid.**, V, 6.
41. **Ibid.**
42. **Ibid.**
43. **Ibid.**, V, 7.
44. **Ibid.**

45. Ibid., V, 2, 3.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., V, 4, 5.
48. Ibid., V, 7, 8.
49. Ibid., II (Introduction).
50. Ibid., II, 1.
51. Ibid., II, 5, 6, 7.
52. Ibid., II, 1, 3.
53. Ibid., II, 3, 2.
54. Ibid., II, 3, 6.
55. Ibid., II, 3, 7.
56. Ibid., II, 3, 8.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., IV, 3, 11.
59. Cf. pp. 2-5.
60. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, ch. III, 3, 3.
61. Ibid., III, 3, 4.
62. Ibid., III, 3, 8.
63. Ibid., III, 3, 9.
64. Ibid., III, 3, 10.
65. Ibid., III, 3, 12.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., III, 3, 13.
68. Ibid., VI, 1, 3.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid., VI, 3, 4.
71. Ibid., VIII, 1, 1.
72. Ibid., VII, 7.
73. Ibid., VIII, 3, 8.
74. Ibid., VII, 3, 9.
75. Ibid.
76. Florovsky, **Egkyklopaideia**, col. 479.
77. Ibid., col. 476.
78. Vladimir Lossky, **The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church** (London, 1957), pp. 37ff, 139ff.
79. **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy**, III, 3, 12.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Robert G. Stephanopoulos. **Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations**. New York Published by the SCOBA and commended to the Clergy for guidance, 1973. Pp vi, 66. Illustrations

The present **Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations** was written by decision of and with the approval of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America (SCOBA) by the Rev. Dr Robert G. Stephanopoulos, General Secretary of SCOBA.

It is divided into two parts, Part One entitled **Orthodox Ecumenical Guidelines** (pp. 1-23), and Part Two, **Orthodox Ecumenical Documents** (pp. 24-63). There are included an introduction by Archbishop Iakovos (pp. iii-iv), a forward by Fr. Stephanopoulos (pp. v-vi) and a Bibliography for further Ecumenical Reading (pp. 64-66).

The new changes and issues particular to American Orthodoxy in the Western Hemisphere with respect to ecumenical relations have necessitated the publication of a second edition in a relatively brief span of time. The present GUIDELINES are concerned particularly with the American situation and are a successful expression of Orthodox ecumenism there. Orthodox ecumenism revolves around two poles: on the one hand, the preservation of the pure Orthodox faith, and on the other, the continuous development of relations and collaboration on an Orthodox Christian basis with other Christian faithful of other religions and, in general, people of good will.

The Table of Contents illustrates clearly and in detail the various possibilities for ecumenical relations and expressions in daily life and activity of Orthodox Christians in America. The Orthodox laity and clergy have in these **Guidelines** an authoritative and useful directive for ecumenical action. Beyond this, however, these directives are to be used with the advice of one's ecclesiastical superior, the Bishop.

One of the characteristics of these **Guidelines** is the precision and the clarity of expression in the definitions and the entire content presented. On page four the two basic ecumenical principles crucial to the involvement and collaboration in the ecumenical movement are presented: the Confessional and the Ecclesiological. Ten additional affirmations are enumerated which derive from the two basic principles, but are of less significance.

The author states that "the inspiration and initial impulse for the modern ecumenical movement came from Protestant sources" (p. 2), even though from the Orthodox viewpoint the encyclicals of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of 1902 and 1920 freely and from the depths of the heart called the world to cooperation.

"The principle of autocephaly is fundamental to Orthodox ecclesiology and an essential part of the structure of the Church." (p. 6). Throughout the centuries this principle has been more widely connected with national, regional, geographical and political factors, in conjunction, of course, with the apostolicity and catholicity of the Church and the common expression of pan-Orthodox unity.

On page eight we read "Theologically, for the Orthodox Church, there is no essential difference between the various communions which have been

separated from it by historical circumstances over the ages. Culturally, liturgically and dogmatically, however, these bodies are more or less proximate to the Orthodox Church as the means used to reconcile individual members of these demonstrates." What is the meaning, here, of the word "dogmatically"?

Today, for reasons of ecumenical courtesy, we avoid as much as possible the use of the terms "heresy" and "schism", a point which is scrupulously observed throughout these **Guidelines**. Ecclesiologically, with respect to the various separated bodies, there is an essential distinction in the application of either heresy or schism by the Church.

Throughout this study it is stated clearly that the Orthodox Church is the One Church confessed in the Nicene Creed—but without a sense of triumphalism, pomposity, slander or discourtesy—and, that there is no sacramental communion permitted with members of other Churches without a previous unity of faith. However, participation in worship of a non-sacramental nature is permitted and encouraged.

In extreme circumstances the **Guidelines** states that from an Orthodox perspective the following is permitted: "In the extreme case that a non-Orthodox person, being without access to the ministrations of his own faith-community, summons an Orthodox priest and declares his faith to be in harmony with that of the Holy Orthodox Church, his or her confession may be heard and the sacraments of Baptism, Chrismation, Holy Unction and/or Holy Communion administered with the understanding that he or she is joining the Orthodox Church" (p. 22).

On pages iii, 2, 6, 24, favorable mention is made of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, its leading place and contribution within the Orthodox communion, its inspiration and leading role in the ecumenical movement by its initiative, and its promulgation of the "outstanding" and "excellent" encyclicals of 1902, 1920, 1952, and 1973. "The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, as *primus inter pares*, has the responsibility for preserving the unity and harmony within the family of Orthodox Churches, chiefly in the area of internal relations between the sister autocephalous churches and in external relations with non-Orthodox communions." (p. 6).

Forty pages are devoted to the inclusion of Orthodox Ecumenical documents (pp. 24-63). The purpose in including these documents was "informative". They are characterized as "exceptional", "excellent", and "outstanding" (p. 2, 24). Indeed these documents demonstrate clearly that Orthodoxy, by participating in the ecumenical movement, in no way betrays her doctrinal and ecclesiological principles. In a positive way, through her ecumenical involvement, the Church has clarified and refined the Orthodox attitudes about ecumenism.

The compilation and publication of these texts aids considerably the reader to understand the history, principles and specific problems of Orthodox ecumenism.

The author states: "It must be understood that these Guidelines are not a final statement on the matter of Orthodox ecumenical relations" (p. 6). These **Guidelines** are the first such attempt, in the second edition, to successfully articulate in a few pages the main contours of Orthodox ecumenism in America. Even more, however, we are of the opinion that these **Guidelines**

would benefit in the same manner all the Orthodox jurisdictions in the world. Moreover, they represent a first rate theological contribution on Orthodox ecumenism of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America, which is a very significant organization for the unity of American Orthodoxy, to world Orthodoxy. Surely these **Guidelines** must be translated into Greek and the languages of the various national Orthodox Churches.

VASILEIOS ISTAVRIDES
*Theological School of Halke
 Istanbul, Turkey*

Johannes Koder and Louis Neyrand, S. J. *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes 16-40, II*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971. Pp. 493.

In 1969 the first volume of the **Loves of the Divine Hymns** of St. Symeon the New (or Young) Theologian appeared as No. 156 in **Les Sources Chrétiennes**. Two years later the second of the three volumes planned has made its welcome appearance. The twenty-six hymns newly published (241 pages of text) added to the previously published fifteen hymns (75 pages of text) constitute the larger part of Symeon's hymnic corpus. When the third volume is published, the first definitive edition of the fifty-eight hymns (10,700 verses) will be completed.

Johannes Koder, who established the critical text of the first volume, is also responsible for the second. In this latest publication Koder had the valuable collaboration of Louis Neyrand, who translated and annotated the hymns. The two collaborators maintain the high standard of scholarship that has from the beginning characterized the series **Les Sources Chrétiennes**, in which this volume is No. 174.

In a brief **avertissement** Neyrand states that in his translations he has followed the principles¹ laid down by Joseph Paramelle, the translator of the first volume of hymns. Neyrand provides his notes with a new addition: a summary of each hymn's content. Inasmuch as the titles given to the hymns by Niketas Stethatos, Symeon's disciple, biographer and first editor, are frequently inexact, and sometimes do not correspond to the actual content, the reader will find Neyrand's summaries very useful. They are given as the first note to each hymn.

Having before him now the text of forty of Symeon's hymns, the student of Byzantine mysticism can more fully comprehend certain fundamental aspects of the Byzantine soul, its obsession with the divine. The major themes are not original with Symeon. They go back to the great Fathers of the fourth century. But in Symeon's hymns they achieve lyric, intensely

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

would benefit in the same manner all the Orthodox jurisdictions in the world. Moreover, they represent a first rate theological contribution on Orthodox ecumenism of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America, which is a very significant organization for the unity of American Orthodoxy, to world Orthodoxy. Surely these **Guidelines** must be translated into Greek and the languages of the various national Orthodox Churches.

VASILEIOS ISTAVRIDES
*Theological School of Halke
 Istanbul, Turkey*

Johannes Koder and Louis Neyrand, S. J. **Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes 16-40, II.** Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971. Pp. 493.

In 1969 the first volume of the **Loves of the Divine Hymns** of St. Symeon the New (or Young) Theologian appeared as No. 156 in **Les Sources Chrétiennes**. Two years later the second of the three volumes planned has made its welcome appearance. The twenty-six hymns newly published (241 pages of text) added to the previously published fifteen hymns (75 pages of text) constitute the larger part of Symeon's hymnic corpus. When the third volume is published, the first definitive edition of the fifty-eight hymns (10,700 verses) will be completed.

Johannes Koder, who established the critical text of the first volume, is also responsible for the second. In this latest publication Koder had the valuable collaboration of Louis Neyrand, who translated and annotated the hymns. The two collaborators maintain the high standard of scholarship that has from the beginning characterized the series **Les Sources Chrétiennes**, in which this volume is No. 174.

In a brief **avertissement** Neyrand states that in his translations he has followed the principles¹ laid down by Joseph Paramelle, the translator of the first volume of hymns. Neyrand provides his notes with a new addition: a summary of each hymn's content. Inasmuch as the titles given to the hymns by Niketas Stethatos, Symeon's disciple, biographer and first editor, are frequently inexact, and sometimes do not correspond to the actual content, the reader will find Neyrand's summaries very useful. They are given as the first note to each hymn.

Having before him now the text of forty of Symeon's hymns, the student of Byzantine mysticism can more fully comprehend certain fundamental aspects of the Byzantine soul, its obsession with the divine. The major themes are not original with Symeon. They go back to the great Fathers of the fourth century. But in Symeon's hymns they achieve lyric, intensely

personal exposition. Here the student will find the purest expression of Byzantium's obsessive mysticism.

Although not intended by the writer as liturgical poetry, or hymns to be sung, Symeon's poems are nevertheless true hymns. They contain the three elements essential to the *hymnos*: address to God in terms of praise, thanksgiving and prayer. Large portions of the poems are doxology, as Symeon fervently sings the glory of God. He cannot do otherwise:

Οὐ γὰρ σιωπᾶν ὑποφέρω, Θεέ μου. (xxiv, 35)

Thanksgiving is likewise conspicuous, since the tenth-century mystic rarely neglects to thank God for His blessings. Repeatedly Symeon refers in gratitude to God's infinite *philanthrōpia*:

πέλαγος ὁρῶν τῆς σῆς φιλανθρωπίας. (xxiv, 53)

In frequent prayers Symeon petitions for more communion with God. The twenty-fourth hymn concludes with such a prayer:

Ἄλλ', ὦ Θεέ μου, ὃ πανοικτίρμον μόνε,
 σπεῦσον, πρόφθασον, ἐπίστρεψόν με πάλιν
 πρὸς μετάνοιαν, πρὸς δάκρυα, πρὸς πένθος,
 ἵνα λούσωμαι καὶ καθαρθῶ καὶ ἴδω
 λάμψασαν τρανῶς ἐν ἐμοὶ τὴν σὴν δόξαν.
 ἦν μοι χάρισαι νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
 δοξάζοντί σε φωναῖς ἀκαταπαύστοις,
 τὸν τῶν αἰώνων ποιητὴν καὶ δεσπότην! (xxiv, 364-371)

The hymns, furthermore, form Symeon's spiritual autobiography. They record in intimate detail his pilgrimage to God, his concentration on the figure of Christ, his reflections on his mission as priest and abbot. From his own experiences comes the authority with which he speaks about *enōsis* and *theōsis*. With an aristocrat's inborn assurance he charts the mystic's progress from earth to heaven. Fired by love of God (*pothos*, a recurrent word) Symeon vividly describes how he withdrew completely from the world—*chōrismos*. Then he prayed incessantly and in tears for divine grace. Finally he saw God and was united with Him.

Symeon's visions and unions with the divine are described in direct, factual, affirmative statements, in solemn language and blazing imagery:

καὶ καθαίρεις καὶ φωτίζεις
 καὶ φωτὸς ποιεῖς μετόχους,
 κοινωνοὺς θεότητός σου,
 ὁμιλεῖς καὶ συλλαλεῖς τε
 ὥσπερ φίλοις σου γνησίοις. (xvii, 66-70)

Despite the knowledge that experience of the divine defies human understanding and description Symeon does not shrink from the compulsion to communicate his mystical encounters with God.

Images of love, light and fire, the Scriptures, dramatic dialogue, and the apophatic vocabulary inherited from earlier Orthodox mystics are employed by Symeon to present the cardinal belief and doctrine of Orthodox mysticism that man can indeed become God. *Theōsis*, he passionately insists over and over again, is the greatest gift of the *philanthrōpos theos* to mankind. This

conviction of Symeon's, sustained by his personal experience, ignites his hymns with a fire that is as bright and intense as the sun itself.

The hymns serve Symeon in yet another way. Not only are they doxology and autobiography, but they are also the vehicle of his teaching. The mystic is often an enthusiastic teacher with divine truths to impart to the world. Symeon's verses reveal a stern abbot, the monastic reformer teaching by word as well as by example the ideal Christian life. The didactic purpose looms strong in Symeon's mind. He is impelled irresistibly to relate to the world his experiences with God in order that he might assist other souls in their struggle for spiritual perfection.

Already in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Byzantines were using Symeon's **Loves of the Divine Hymns** for contemplative reading. Such reading may not be high fashion in our frenetic world, but I am emboldened to suggest that Symeon's radiant and joyful hymns will not only illuminate Byzantium, but also the complexities and yearnings of the human soul.

One has but to pick up the hymns and read.

EVA CATAFYGIOTU TOPPING
Cincinnati, Ohio

NOTE

1. Johannes Koder and Joseph Paramelle, S. J., **Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes 1-15, I** (Paris, 1969), pp. 9-12.

Marjorie Carpenter, **Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, I; On the Person of Christ**. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1970. Pp. xlv, 380. **Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, II; On Christian Life**. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973. Pp. xi, 309. \$22.50 each.

Sooner or later a major writer will win the attention he deserves. After long centuries of neglect St. Romanos the Melodos is at last coming into his own. During the last decade Byzantium's and Christendom's prince of liturgical poets has attracted the devotion and scholarship of scholars both in our own country and in Europe.

The publication of Dr. Marjorie Carpenter's translations of the Christian Pindar is a welcome and important addition to the rapidly growing Romanic bibliography. It is particularly important because these translations, the first into English, will introduce the Byzantine poet to Greekless students and lovers of poetry.

There is, of course, no substitute for reading a writer in his own language. However, the closest we can come to the original text is by reading a transla-

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

George C. Papademetriou, **Introduction to Saint Gregory Palamas**. New York: Philosophical Library, 1973. Pp. 103. \$5.00

The writings of Saint Gregory Palamas, the fourteenth-century Archbishop of Thessalonike, have been the subject of increased discussion within the last decade or so and the importance of his work for Greek Orthodox theology has been clearly recognized by contemporary scholars and churchmen. It is of primary concern to all involved that St. Gregory Palamas be better known among students of Orthodoxy and among Orthodox Christians. Father George Papademetriou has sought to provide the general reader with such an introduction that shows that "St. Gregory stood fast to Orthodox doctrines of man's relations with God. His contribution is mainly in his elaboration of the distinction between divine essence and divine energies, thus making God accessible to man. The greatness of St. Gregory Palamas is to be found in his emphatic and carefully elaborated assertion of the ability of creaturehood to communicate with Divinity (divine energies), without confusion of the two natures, thus saving Orthodox theology from pantheism" (p. 67).

The theology of Saint Gregory Palamas is sophisticated and complicated. Father Papademetriou's little book offers the serious student the opportunity to familiarize himself with the life and works of the saint, locate the primary and the secondary sources that are now available, and confront him with "his bold formulation of the mystical element of Christianity, his participation in the **Hesychastic** controversy, and his defense of the traditional biblical interpretation of the Christian experience of truth" (p. 17). The five main sections introduce the subject and Saint Gregory Palamas's place in Orthodox theology and role in the Hesychastic controversy, expound his views on the Essence and Energies of God, the Person and Work of Christ, and on Sin and Grace. The ultimate aim for St. Gregory Palamas is to attain knowledge of God by a purity of heart because through union with God the believer can attain a vision of "all immaterial knowledge" by the communion of the divine uncreated light. "We do not receive God's knowledge from created beings but from the uncreated light, which is the glory of God and revealed to us through Christ" (p. 31).

The question of knowledge in philosophy and theology, the nature and essence of God and their relation to the Holy Trinity, the nature of the Divine Light and its communication through the Divine Energies, Incarnation, Redemption, Creation and Fall, and Divine Grace are all topics that are essential in understanding St. Gregory Palamas and that the reader is succinctly introduced to with clarity and reasonableness, though it is clear that after such an introduction the reader must go to the original Palamite texts for detailed exegesis and illumination. Father Papademetriou's **Introduction to Saint Gregory Palamas** paves the way for such a detailed study that should be the aim of those who would gain a true understanding of Orthodox mysticism and the Orthodox conception of God.

JOHN E. REXINE
Colgate University

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

conviction of Symeon's, sustained by his personal experience, ignites his hymns with a fire that is as bright and intense as the sun itself.

The hymns serve Symeon in yet another way. Not only are they doxology and autobiography, but they are also the vehicle of his teaching. The mystic is often an enthusiastic teacher with divine truths to impart to the world. Symeon's verses reveal a stern abbot, the monastic reformer teaching by word as well as by example the ideal Christian life. The didactic purpose looms strong in Symeon's mind. He is impelled irresistibly to relate to the world his experiences with God in order that he might assist other souls in their struggle for spiritual perfection.

Already in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Byzantines were using Symeon's *Loves of the Divine Hymns* for contemplative reading. Such reading may not be high fashion in our frenetic world, but I am emboldened to suggest that Symeon's radiant and joyful hymns will not only illuminate Byzantium, but also the complexities and yearnings of the human soul.

One has but to pick up the hymns and read.

EVA CATAFYGIOTU TOPPING
Cincinnati, Ohio

NOTE

1. Johannes Koder and Joseph Paramelle, S. J., *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes 1-15, I* (Paris, 1969), pp. 9-12.

Marjorie Carpenter, *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, I; On the Person of Christ*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1970. Pp. xlv, 380. *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, II; On Christian Life*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1973. Pp. xi, 309. \$22.50 each.

Sooner or later a major writer will win the attention he deserves. After long centuries of neglect St. Romanos the Melodos is at last coming into his own. During the last decade Byzantium's and Christendom's prince of liturgical poets has attracted the devotion and scholarship of scholars both in our own country and in Europe.

The publication of Dr. Marjorie Carpenter's translations of the Christian Pindar is a welcome and important addition to the rapidly growing Romanic bibliography. It is particularly important because these translations, the first into English, will introduce the Byzantine poet to Greekless students and lovers of poetry.

There is, of course, no substitute for reading a writer in his own language. However, the closest we can come to the original text is by reading a transla-

tion in our own native tongue. So often we have no choice—it is a translation or nothing at all.

Dr. Carpenter has translated in two volumes the fifty-nine kontakia of Romanos which Paul Maas and C. A. Trypanis published as genuine in *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina* (Oxford, 1963). She bases her translations on the Maas-Trypanis text, uses their titles and follows their enumeration.

The first volume includes translations of the Christological kontakia (1-34), among which are found Romanos' masterpieces such as "On the Nativity I", "On the Presentation in the Temple", "On Judas", "Mary at the Cross", and others. The second volume contains kontakia on a variety of subjects: episodes from the New Testament (35-39), and the Old Testament (40-46) as well; on various themes (47-56), ranging from baptism (53) and life in a monastery (55) to earthquakes and fires (54); and a final group based on saints' lives (57-59).

In an appendix to the second volume (pp. 297-309) Dr. Carpenter has added an introduction and translation of the "Akathistos Hymnos", the magnificent hymn of praise to the Theotokos, believed by many scholars to have been written by Romanos. Although the question of authorship may never be satisfactorily settled, it is good to have another champion of Romanos on record, and to have an English translation of Byzantium's greatest hymn to its divine protectress, the Mother of God.

In the long introduction of the first volume (pp. xiii-xliv) Dr. Carpenter initiates her reader into the Byzantine mysteries of Romanos' poetry. She discusses the life of the poet, the Syrian-born deacon who lived and wrote during the golden age of Justinian; the hybrid nature of the kontakion, the poetic sermon, a genre unknown in English or in any other European literature; the poetic and theological characteristics of these hymns and their liturgical setting. The careful reader of these pages will find himself well prepared to read the poems that follow. A basic bibliography and a useful list of definitions conclude the introduction. No novice or initiate into Romanos' poetry should overlook these introductory pages.

A brief introduction is included in the second volume (pp. vii-x).

Specific discussions of each kontakion further prepare the reader for the intricacies of Romanos' elaborate, complex poems. Each translation is preceded by an introduction in which Dr. Carpenter discusses the manuscript tradition, the Biblical and homiletic sources, the style and content of the kontakion. She also lists all other editions of the hymn. Additional notes accompany the text of each translation.

There is no need to repeat here all the well-known, insoluble problems and difficulties that beset every translator. Suffice it to say that these problems in the case of Romanos expand into light-year proportions. The Byzantine poet is separated from his translator not only by language, and a millennium and a half in time, but also by a distinctive culture. Theocratic Byzantium appears to us an exotic, almost incomprehensible world, its eyes fixed on an invisible beyond, its soul intent on mystical communion with God. Romanos composed his poetic sermons for a people who believed in demons and God, and who found abstruse theology more relevant to them than the cost of living.

How, then, does a twentieth-century American translator transfer a sacred poet from sixth-century Constantinople to her own time and place? How does she sail to and back from the many-domed city by that "dolphin-torn, that gong-tormented sea"?

These translations of Romanos' fifty-nine genuine kontakia answer for Dr. Carpenter. She depended on scholarship bolstered by sensitivity and sympathy.

She paid scrupulous attention to the Greek, the nuances and peculiarities of the language used by a Hellenised Jew, writing poetry for liturgical use in the Orthodox Church, a thousand years after the classic poets of Athens. Every single word required hours of sensitive scrutiny, consultation with lexica, debate and finally a decision. Always, translation of poetry involves an agony of choice and inevitable compromise.

Dr. Carpenter's empathy with Romanos and sympathy for his sacred vocation and vision provided the insights that bring into her translation the same life that animates the original Greek text. Her skill uncovers for the Greekless reader the antitheses, the imagery, the dramatic vividness of the kontakia. To succeed in her formidable undertaking Dr. Carpenter spent many days and nights in a far off time and place. Therefore, in her rhythmic, poetic lines we can hear the clear, fervent voice of Byzantium's genius poet-priest.

Long ago Romanos had prayed for divine help and inspiration. He ended his beautiful Resurrection kontakion (no. 29) with these verses. The translation is by Dr. Carpenter.

My Father, holy and full of compassion,
 May Thy name always be holy
 In my mouth and spirit,
 In my voice and my song.
 Grant to me grace as I herald Thy hymns, since Thou hast
 power,
 Thou who dost offer resurrection to the fallen.

Little could the Byzantine poet have guessed or foreseen that one day his hymns would be read in a land not yet discovered, in a language not yet formed. The translations in the two volumes under review convey to the English-speaking reader Romanos' strength and grace as poet and priest.

Dr. Carpenter successfully heralds Romanos' kontakia in English.

EVA CATAFYGIOTU TOPPING
Cincinnati, Ohio

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

A MONOTHELITE KONTAKION OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY¹

By L. WILLIAM COUNTRYMAN

The anonymous kontakion "On the Holy Fathers"² possesses a particular interest for students of church history as well as for Byzantinists, now that C. A. Trypanis has shown in his introduction to the poem that it is an "heretical" work, written to celebrate the *Ekthesis* of the Emperor Heraklios, fundamental document of the short-lived monothelite theology.

Paul Maas, in 1910, had considered that the poem was early sixth century, perhaps by the great Romanos himself.³ In any case, he believed it to have been written by a contemporary of Romanos and felt that in all probability its composition had preceded that of Romanos' Eastern hymn *Τὸν πρὸ ἡλίου ἥλιον*, which shares the same meter and melody.

Trypanis, however, in his edition of 1968 noted a number of features which called for a much later dating of the poem. They are briefly, as follows: (1) there is reference to the holy robe of the Virgin,⁴ which we know was credited with a role in saving Constantinople from the combined forces of Persians, Avars and Slavs in 626 A.D.; (2) theologically, the poem follows the order of and sometimes uses the exact words of Heraklios' *Ekthesis*, published in 638 at a synod held in Constantinople for its ratification; (3) the lists of heresies condemned in both works are the same; (4) the channels of authority by which the councils are said to act are the same; (5) the poem is inspired by a council contemporary with the author (cf. stanza xi), which, like the council ratifying the *Ekthesis*, is viewed as belonging in the series of Ecumenical Councils.⁵

These arguments provide a *terminus post quem* for the poem of A.D. 638 or 639.⁶ Probably it must have been written very soon thereafter, since the doctrine of "one will" expounded in the *Ekthesis* quickly ran into opposition and was probably repudiated

even by Heraklios himself before his death on February 11, 641. We may thus fix a date of approximately 640, which makes this poem one of the later great kontakia composed in the East. (Other implications of this dating, as they affect the understanding of the poem, will be found in the notes.)

For those readers who are not familiar with the kontakion, it may be well to explain something about this form in order to show why a poem such as this may be highly theological in content and purpose. The Greek kontakion, which took its rise about the end of the fifth century, is essentially a homily in verse, modelled to begin with on the similar, but less ornate Syriac *memrā*. Other Syriac poetic forms also influenced it: from the *madrāšā* it derived more complex meters, a refrain, and an acrostich comprised of the first letter of each stanza; from the *sugīthā* comes a penchant for telling Biblical stories in dialogue form. The Byzantines themselves appear to have added the prooemium (*κουκούλιον*) with which they invariably introduce their kontakia and which is not included in the acrostich.

It is the homiletic character of the kontakion which makes it of particular theological interest; and its Biblical basis often supplies a surprising and intriguing glimpse into Byzantine use and understanding of the Bible.

A word about the music of the kontakion is also in order, since the music was intimately related to the structure of the poems. A kontakion was sung to two separate melodies, one for the prooemium and one for the stanzas (*οἵκοι*). As the meter of the stanzas is apt to be very complex, the first stanza served as a model which the rest followed. Such a model stanza might even serve as the basis for a new composition; and such is in fact the case with the present work, which is based on Romanos' *Τὸν πρὸ ἡλίου ἥλιον*. But even in such instances of imitation, the poet was free to go his own way in regard to the meter and tune of the prooemium; and thus in this kontakion the poem is *ιδιόμελον*, "having its own melody."

The kontakia continue to be used in the Greek church on the feasts for which they were written, though they have been reduced to the prooemium and one or two initial stanzas. To a great extent they were superseded during and after the Iconoclastic period by the poetic form known as the *kanōn*. These kanons are less homiletical, being based rather on the canticles sung at the daily offices. Egon Wellesz has suggested that a revival of regular

preaching made the kontakion redundant.⁷ The continuing elaboration of music in this period was doubtless another factor which promoted the change, for the words of the kanon are more subordinate to the music.

The style of the present kontakion is not unusual, apart from some extraordinary mixing of metaphors.⁸ The language is lofty and strongly Biblical in character. In particular the influence of the Psalms and of I & II Timothy is noticeable. The echoes of the Psalter are not, of course, surprising, since that portion of the Bible became familiar to every clergyman through weekly repetition in the daily offices. The influence of the two epistles to Timothy is perhaps to be explained by the fact that the Pastoral Epistles in general exhibit a strong sense of tradition and even of orthodoxy—elements of particular importance to our author's propagandistic purpose. For whoever he may have been, he wished to emphasize that the Ekthesis and the synods which ratified it were in the tradition of the great ecumenical councils and their doctrine.

For basic stylistic comparisons with Romanos, the reader may consult Maas's edition.

The present article seeks to provide an English translation of this hitherto little known work for the benefit of students of church history and theology and, at the same time, through the translation and its accompanying notes, to elucidate certain difficulties and obscurities in the poem itself. In addition, the Biblical references given in the notes—for which the author does not claim exhaustive completeness—may perhaps form a small contribution to the study of Biblical foundations of early Christian poetic language.

ON THE HOLY FATHERS

PROEM: The church, [guarding] the preaching of the apostles and the doctrines of the fathers, has set her seal⁹ to the one faith. And wearing the garment of truth, which is woven of the heavenly knowledge of God, she rightly handles¹⁰ and glorifies the great mystery of godliness.¹¹

I: Let us listen to God's church as she cries out in her sublime preaching:¹² "Let him who thirsts come to me;¹³ the wine-bowl which I carry is a wine-bowl of wisdom. I have mixed¹⁴ this drink with the word of truth;¹⁵ it pours out not the water of strife,¹⁶ but

of confession.¹⁷ When the present Israel¹⁸ drinks of this confession, it beholds God saying, 'See! See that I am He¹⁹ and I do not change;²⁰ I am God at the beginning and thereafter,²¹ and apart from me there is no other at all.'²² They that partake of this will be filled²³ and will praise the great mystery of godliness."²⁴

- II: I hear of Jericho²⁵ and Siloam²⁶ and the country about Jerusalem with many waters flowing perceptibly. But their waters remain [ed] bad and lifeless until the great Elisha²⁷ healed them, mingling his blessing with salt, making the life-giving power spring up in them by the Spirit.

But here are the greater things. For the church has waters running and leaping forth from this to that²⁸ without flowing, without noise—waters that give life, that make us divine,²⁹ never suffering eclipse, always shining out upon the great mystery of godliness.

- III: The Lord's bride,³⁰ possessing these spiritual symbols³¹ as a divine betrothal, is adorned in many ways. And the spring of these rivers is the Holy Spirit. But know the sources—the conduits and channels, if you will: first apostles, then prophets, thirdly teachers; to these add kinds of tongues, too, as Paul has counted it out.³² For the very merciful Master of the Earth has put these in the church as channels, from which to water the whole circle of the inhabited world, pouring out Spirit upon all whom the great mystery of godliness has illumined.

- IV: Having received the traditions, then, from above—from God and those who are his, the holy church keeps them³³—she who, alone and unique, is confirmed and reigns from one end of the world to the other. For she was founded on a word then when the Word said to Peter,³⁴ "Blessed are you, Simon, because you recognized me as Son of God, for the Father alone revealed this to you from above. And I say to you that you are Peter and on this rock I found my church, which the underworld³⁵ gates will not alter—nor will they hinder the great mystery of godliness."

- V: What he spoke became law; the word appeared as a seal; and the rock remains forever unshaken. Rivers³⁶

and torrents³⁷ of lawlessness have come forth—and all their strength was poured out like water.³⁸ For as much as the faith is attacked, the stronger it becomes, competing always according to rule³⁹ and raising trophies. Where are they⁴⁰ who once spoke against this fold, but did not [succeed in] plunder[ing] it? Men who breathed murder,⁴¹ who were full of trickery, who sharpened their tongues against God?⁴² Has not the Most High winnowed them all, and has not the great mystery of godliness triumphed?

- VI: For you know in what ways Arios⁴³ and the followers of Arios raved against her many times like barking dogs; and they said the Word did not exist before he was begotten,⁴⁴ calling him a creature through whom all things were made,⁴⁵ who was begotten before the morning star,⁴⁶ who called light out of the non-existent⁴⁷ with a word, who shaped man.

Be merciful! Be merciful! Be merciful to all, you that are co-eternal and consubstantial⁴⁸ with the Father!

They dared these things; but they appeared like ashes, swept away to Hades. They have been cut off,⁴⁹ but the great mystery of godliness remains indivisible.⁵⁰

- VII: Thus the divine justice above dealt quickly with the impious one and his blasphemers; and he was not deemed worthy to see the glory of the Lord. For he did not understand, but walked in darkness⁵¹ along with Sabellios⁵² the condemned. For these two evils are contrary to each other,⁵³ but share the same honor in falsehood. For this man, this thrice accursed, spoke of [one] person, three-named, in the Trinity, without making any distinction⁵⁴—and without differing from the madness of the Jews.⁵⁵ The wretch followed them and denied the great mystery of godliness.

- VIII: They fell under this immovable rock—and likewise such as blasphemed after them according to their example, who would not consent to call the Spirit God,⁵⁶ but drew him down into the creation like a slave.

You that are of this graceless madness, how were you liberated?⁵⁷ How, if you do not accept the Spirit who is holy and Lord? Whence is the adoption as sons given

you?⁵⁸ Consider, and answer. For if you deny [the Spirit] you have fallen from this [adoption], deprived of the One who gave it. But as for us, we know the Spirit as our God and we glorify the great mystery of godliness.

IX: Though the church of God receives many a shock⁵⁹ from great waves, as has been said, it has not been shaken, but has grown stronger and remains firmly established. For others, again, attacked in various ways, wishing to trouble and shake the ineffable mystery of Christ's coming and his generous concession.⁶⁰ Some of these secretly introduced a denial of the flesh,⁶¹ others of the divinity.⁶² And they dared to say that he who walked on the sea⁶³ was a mere man. Many are the storms, then, from various directions, which the great mystery of godliness has stilled.⁶⁴

X:⁶⁵ On account of all these things, the holy fathers, assembling at the proper times,⁶⁶ like shepherds of the sheep⁶⁷ cut out the bitter weeds⁶⁸ and led the sheep to the sweet grass. They barred⁶⁹ all the entryways so that no wolf⁷⁰ or other evil thing might come in and a sheep be lost. These [men], then, shot with their anathemas as with a sling at the leaders of the heresies; and the orthodox people and the feet of the priests trampled them. For we have stood by what is right and we proclaim the great mystery of godliness.

[Xbis: On account of all these things, therefore, grace gathered together at their proper times the five councils⁷¹ of the fathers—the same in number as our senses—and made the knowledge of truth plain through them. And again [grace] gathered yet another council here against Severos,⁷² enemy of the orthodox faith. These [councils] shot with their anathemas as if with a sling at these leaders of heresies—one of whom was this Severos, the common receptacle of all filthiness. For he stirred up everything and mixed all together; he worked harm to the great mystery of godliness.]

XI: Some of God's Spirit which was in Moses was given, as it is written, to seventy elders,⁷³ so that they might take up cases along with him who brought that people out [of Egypt] and led them. But now there is given to

the god-bearing fathers the grace which the holy apostles received from heaven.⁷⁴ While this [council] was in session,⁷⁵ then, they received [it] and made the divine sayings plain, leading the people, dispersing error,⁷⁶ and establishing the inhabited world without turbulence or shocks, having guarded⁷⁷ the great mystery of godliness as they had received it.

XII: We marvel at Daniel because he passed judgment and exposed the shame of the two old men.⁷⁸ But we marvel more at these fathers, for they condemned the priests of the shame, having saved not just one Susanna but many, whom Paul had betrothed to the one Christ as one [bride]⁷⁹—I mean the souls of those who believe on the Lord, who governs our breath and cries out to all, "Let him who wishes to follow me not stumble."⁸⁰ For I am the eternal light, without any evening, out of which the great mystery of godliness has shone."

XIII:⁸¹ In heaven and on earth one choir is brought to perfection; a harmony of angels and men is welded together. In one Trinity the Godhead is praised,⁸² and in unity the divine Trinity is glorified. And him who was incarnate of the Virgin we acknowledge as truly one of the Trinity,⁸³ himself God and man.⁸⁴ His alike, we say, are both the sufferings and the miracles⁸⁵—the chief of which is the child-bearing of Mary, for which she is hymned as God-bearer⁸⁶ by the whole world. For by magnifying her, we are saved, by learning the great mystery of godliness.

XIV: She heard Gabriel's word of joy as he spoke and cried out to her, "Hail, highly favored one."⁸⁷ And as she gave birth, she at once took away our griefs. And when we fall again into wailing and sorrow, she quickly bows in intercession⁸⁸—says in prayer to him who was born of her, "My Son, my God, and my Creator, you became man for the sake of men; and I bore and nursed the One who exists before all things, who rained bread from the heavens on the people in the desert."⁸⁹ Now then, O supremely Good, have pity on those to whom you have given the great mystery of godliness."

XV: We all as Christians have her as protection⁹⁰—a wall

in wars and a calm in dangers, but especially the royal city:⁹¹ first, because faithful men rule over her;⁹² then, because she is exceedingly pious. And she guards the precious robe of the God-bearer by which especially she is protected;⁹³ and she says, "O Lady, keep me ever as a child in the shelter of your hands, just as you have already thwarted swords and not thrust my prayer aside. You turned my enemies away; and those who persecuted the great mystery of godliness have fled."

XVI: And you, Most High God, born of a Virgin, the only ruler, both of things above and things below, you that always show favor through⁹⁴ her intercessions, you that pasture your sheep as⁹⁵ an innocent shepherd—deliver your people from every necessity. Give victories to the emperors⁹⁶ and lasting peace to your dominions. Ransom, O Lord, the churches which unclean feet have trampled and men of blood,⁹⁷ who have not hoped in your name, have plundered. Search out the blood of your servants and vindicate the great mystery of godliness.

FOOTNOTES

1. This article would not have been possible without the advice, assistance and encouragement of C. A. Trypanis, generously given.
2. Greek text published by Paul Maas, *Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie* (Bonn, 1910) and by C. A. Trypanis, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* ("Wiener Byzantinistische Studien," V; Vienna, 1968). In some manuscripts the kontakion has the title "On the (318) Holy Fathers of the Council of Nicaea"; but this is belied both by the acrostich, which reads simply "on [the] holy fathers" and also by the theological content of the poem, which clearly goes well beyond Nicaea. All councils to the time of the author are celebrated.
3. Anciently regarded as inventor of the kontakion form, and generally regarded as its greatest practitioner.
4. Stanza xv.
5. See notes to the present translation for further discussion of each of these points. For detailed support of them, see Trypanis, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90.
6. When a second council was held for the same purpose.

7. Egon Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1961), pp. 202-04.
8. Cf. stanzas ii and iii.
9. (Proem 2) I.e. "attested"; cf. John 3:33. (The numbers in parentheses at the head of each footnote refer to the lines of the Greek text).
10. (Proem 5) II Tim. 2:15.
11. (Proem 5) "The great mystery of godliness," I Tim. 3:16; cf. 3:9. This phrase forms a refrain throughout the poem, carefully incorporated each time into the sentence structure of the line preceding. It is no easier, however, to define the precise meaning of the phrase here than in the Biblical passage from which it derives. At times it means the "revealed truth about God" (Proem, stanzas iii, xii, xiii, xiv), specifically orthodox doctrine (vii, viii, x, xi). At other times it seems to refer rather to the organized and established expression of that truth, i.e. the Orthodox Church (ii, iv, v, vi, [x], xv, xvi). In one instance it perhaps refers to the Eucharist (i); in another it may mean God himself (ix).
12. (α'1) Prov. 9:3 LXX.
13. (α'2) John 7:37.
14. (α'4) Prov. 9:2.
15. (α'4) II Timothy 2:15; cf. p. 4, n. 2.
16. (α'5) I.e. the "Waters of Mara"; Num 20:13.
17. (α'6) I Tim. 6:12. "Strife" and "confession" form a paronomasia in the Greek: ἀντιλογία...ὁμολογία.
18. (α'6) I.e. the new Israel.
19. (α'9) Isa. 41:4; cf. 43:10.
20. (α'9) Mal. 3:6.
21. (α'10) Isa. 41:4; cf. 44:6.
22. (α'11) Isa. 45:5, 6, 21.
23. (α'12) Cf. Luke 1:53.
24. The entire first stanza has reference to the Eucharist, the second to Baptism.
25. (β'1-6) II Kings 2:19-22.
26. (β'1) John 9:7.
27. (β'1-6) II Kings 2:19-22.
28. (β'10) Psalm 74:9 (75:8) LXX. The phrase "from this to that" is oddly weak in so emphatic and effusive a passage; it can only be understood as acquiring a certain force from its familiar Biblical context. The LXX of Psalm 74:8-9a may be translated thus: "For God is judge; he humbles **this** man and exalts **that** one. There is a cup of unmixed wine in the Lord's hand, full of mixture; and it bends **from this to that**." Thus the phrase has a strong connotation of "from humiliation to exaltation."
29. (β'11) Baptism. Perhaps compare John 10:34.
30. (γ'2) The church. Eph. 5:2-32.
31. (γ'1) The two sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.
32. (γ'7) I Cor. 12:28. Part of Paul's list is omitted by the poet, only the first

32 THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

three and the last terms being given. It is hard to say what relevance the author found in the mention of "tongues," which were hardly a feature of church life in his day. Perhaps he thought of them, in the light of Acts 2 5-11, as a gift of language necessary to missionary preaching.

33. (δ'2) II Thess. 2 15.
34. (δ'6-12) Matthew 16 17-18.
35. (δ'12) The Biblical passage has "the gates of Hades," a more natural expression.
36. (ε'3) Matthew 7 25.
37. (ε'3) Psalm 17 5 (18 4).
38. (ε'4) Psalm 21 15 (22 14).
39. (ε'6) II Tim. 2 5.
40. (ε'8) Compare the Arian song recorded in Socrates VI 8, 2 "Where are they who say that the three are one power?"
41. (ε'10) Acts 9 1.
42. (ε'11) Psalm 63 4 (64 3).
43. (στ1) Arius, who taught that the Word was a creature and not truly God, was condemned at the First Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325—the first of the five councils commemorated in this kontakion.
44. (στ'3) A favorite Arian slogan ran "There was when he was not", i.e. the Son, unlike the Father, had a beginning and was not eternal.
45. (στ'4) John 1 3.
46. (στ'5) Psalm 109 (110) 3 LXX.
47. (στ'6) Cf. Romans 4 17 as well as Gen. 1 3.
48. (στ'9) The key word accepted at Nicaea to exclude Arian notions of a basic difference in nature between Father and Son.
49. (στ'12) Cf. Psalm 34 (35) 15 LXX.
50. (στ'12) Probably "incapable of being split by heresy", indeed, the Greek word here (ἀδιάρητον) is related to our word "heresy."
51. (ζ'4) Isa. 9 2 (9 1 LXX).
52. (ζ'5) Sabellios, who flourished under Pope Kallistos I (217-22) and was eventually excommunicated by him, taught that the distinctions among the three persons of the Trinity were purely modal, not essential or enduring. His heresy preceded that of Arius by a century, his inclusion **after** Arius in the kontakion may reflect the fact that some extremists among the supporters of Nicaea (e.g. Marcellos of Ancyra) were labelled "Sabellians." The First Council of Constantinople (381) condemned Sabellianism, as its synodical letter shows.
53. (ζ'6) Sabellios' teaching was "contrary" to that of Arius in the sense that it recognized no real distinction between Father and Son, while Arius held to a radical difference of nature between them. It is noteworthy that Arius and Sabellios are the two heretics singled out in the main body of the **Ekthesis** (Mansi X, 992D), the others attacked in this kontakion are merely listed at the end (996D-E).
54. (ζ'10) I.e. among the three persons.
55. (ζ'11) Because of his exclusive emphasis on the **unity** of the godhead. The

language is astonishing, not so much because of its regrettable, but familiar anti-Jewish tone as because it seems to dismiss the whole Biblical witness to monotheism!

56. (η'3) The Pneumatomachi, often called "Macedonians" after 380, although there is no evidence that Macedonios of Constantinople held to their opinions. They accepted the consubstantiality of Son with Father, but not that of the Holy Spirit. Their leader was Eustathios of Sebaste. They were condemned at the First Council of Constantinople, 381.
57. (η'6) Cf. Romans 8:2, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has liberated me from the law of sin and death."
58. (η'8) Cf. Romans 8:15, "You received the Spirit of adoption." Hence the Spirit and the adoption are conceived as inseparable by the poet; he who rejects the one rejects the other.
59. (θ'1) Cf. Luke 21:25. The church is apparently conceived here as a ship; compare the last sentence of the stanza, with its echo of Christ's stilling of the waters.
60. (θ'6) The word *οἰκονομία* is difficult to translate. In accordance with New Testament usage (cf. Eph. 3:9), it might mean "plan of salvation" here; but the passage seems to accord better with the later, ecclesiastical usage of the word, where it signifies an authoritative exemption from normal rules for the sake of charity. The whole incarnation is here summed up in one word as a gracious and entirely unmerited act of generosity on God's part.
61. (θ'8) The phrase "denial of the flesh" fits most readily the second-century tendency to Docetism—that is, rejection of any notion that the divine Son could have suffered in a human body; either the body was a mirage or else the divine was not really united to it. Here, however, I think the poet is referring in a veiled way to the doctrine of Eutyches, the Monophysite teacher condemned at Chalcedon (451). Eutyches was reluctant to say that the Incarnate Lord was "consubstantial with us" (though he would say that he took flesh from the Virgin who was consubstantial with us). His opponents interpreted his rejection of the phrase as a revived Docetism. (See J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* [2nd ed.; New York, 1960], pp. 332-33.)

As an attack on Monophysite doctrine, the line is certainly both obscure and weak—especially as compared with the poet's more forceful attacks on Arios, Sabellios and the Pneumatomachi. Undoubtedly this sudden failure of clarity was dictated by the circumstances of the kontakion's composition, for the *Ekthesis* was meant precisely to conciliate the Monophysites. Still, the poet could not omit them entirely from his list of heresies, for Chalcedon was still to be recognized among the authentic general councils.

62. (θ'9) Once again, the obvious reference is to much earlier heresies—Ebionism (a Jewish-Christian sect), the second-century Adoptionism of Theodotos and Artemon, and above all the teachings of Paul of Samosata, condemned at the synod of Antioch in 268. All taught that Jesus was a human being exceptionally endowed with divine inspiration. (Kelly, pp. 117-18, 139-40.) We must see in this "denial of divinity," however, a reference to Nestorios, who had objected to the honoring of the Virgin as

θεοτόκος ("God-bearer") on the ground that she was only the bearer of the particular man Jesus. Nestorios did not, in fact, deny the intimate and indissoluble incarnation of the Son in Christ; but his opponents interpreted his teaching in that way, some (e.g. Eusebios of Dorylaeum) even accusing him of Adoptionism (Kelly, p. 311.) Nestorios was condemned at the Council of Ephesos, 431.

Here as above when referring to the Monophysites, the poet treads carefully. While the Nestorians proper were not within the purview of the *Ekthesis* and were therefore open to attack, many Monophysites regarded Chalcedonian orthodoxy as *de facto* Nestorian. It was not, therefore, in accord with the irenic intent of the *Ekthesis* for the poet to use *any* of the current labels deriving from Christological controversy.

63. (θ'11) Matthew 14:26.
64. (θ'12) Mark 4:37-39.
65. Maas prints the secondary version of stanza X first and numbers the original "ι'bis." I follow Trypanis in printing the original first and numbering the later addition "ι'bis." Maas and Trypanis agree that the present is the original tenth stanza. The acrostich does not allow for more than one of the two and, in any case, they are obvious duplicates.
66. (ι'1) This phrase, along with the theological content of the preceding stanzas, makes it clear that more than one council forms the subject of the poem. It is a celebration of all general councils.
67. (ι'2) Cf. Heb. 13:20.
68. (ι'3) That is, the heretics were excommunicated and their teachings anathematized. The language derives from the parable of the Wheat and Tares (Matt. 13:24-30); in the explanation of the parable (vss. 36-43) Jesus explains the weeds as "the sons of the Evil One."
69. (ι'5) "Barred"—literally, "fenced with a palisade."
70. (ι'6) Cf. Acts 20:29.
71. (ι'bis 2) Presumably the first five general councils: I Nicaea (325); I Constantinople (381); Ephesos (431); Chalcedon (451); II Constantinople (553).
72. (ι'bis 6) Severos (c. 465-538) had been Patriarch of Antioch, 512-518, but was deposed as a heretic. He "became the eloquent exponent of Monophysitism in his famous theological discourses" (Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* [London, 1968], pp. 72-73).

It would be most natural, in view of the vehemence of this stanza, to suppose that the council in question was the synod which excommunicated Severos in 536 at Constantinople; but if that is the case, what list of *five* councils is intended at the beginning of the stanza? We must rather look for some posthumous condemnation of Severos at a synod later than 553. The synod of 638 at Constantinople, by ratifying the *Ekthesis*, did in fact anathematize Severos (Mansi X, 996E).

Trypanis (p. 91, n. 22) deduces that this spurious strophe is very nearly as old as the poem itself. The vehemence of feeling evident in it is to be explained by the fact that "Severian" was a common equivalent for "Monophysite" in the early seventh century; see Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church* (Edinburgh, 1896), V, pp. 4-6.

The spurious stanza must emanate from a circle which opposed reunion with the "Severians" or else have been written as it became clear that the **Ekthesis** had failed of its purpose.

73. (1α' 1-2) Num. 11:16f., 25.
74. (1α' 5-7) This grace is clearly understood as superior to that received by Moses' elders; no doubt a reference to Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4) is intended.
75. (1α' 7) Probably the poet made no distinction between the synods of 638 and 639, which were, in fact, devoted to the same item of business—ratification and promulgation of the **Ekthesis**. The claim that these synods belong in the tradition of General Councils is very clear here and recalls the reverence for the Five Councils expressed in the **Ekthesis** itself.
76. (1α' 10) Cf. Eusebios, *H. E.* IV 24, where the bishops are represented in very similar language as driving off heresy.
77. (1α' 12) Cf. the phrase τὴν παραθήκην φυλάσσειν, "to guard the deposit of faith," in I Tim. 6:20, II Tim. 1:12-14.
78. (1β' 1-2) The apocryphal prologue to Daniel contains the story of Susanna and the elders.
79. (1β' 6-7) Although the quotation is far from exact, the reference must be to II Cor. 11:2. The "many Susannas" are the Christian believers joined together in the one church, which is Christ's bride.
80. (1β' 11) John 11:9-10.
81. Stanza xiii contains the entire positive theological statement of the kontakion; as such it counters all the heresies listed in stanzas vi-ix with the corresponding orthodox doctrines. The passage also follows closely the (much longer and more diffuse) doctrinal declarations of the **Ekthesis** (Greek text in J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence, 1759f., X, 992-97; for an English translation of the most pertinent passages see Hefele, V, 62-64). It is surprising that there is no positive assertion of the doctrine of the One Will itself, but it is to that happy omission that we owe the poem's preservation. Was the poet less than whole-heartedly in favor of the Emperor's theological project? Or was it felt that the best line of propaganda was to stay away from theological argumentation and stress the authority of the council which promulgated the doctrine?
82. (1γ' 3-4) Or perhaps "The one Godhead is praised in Trinity" (reading μίᾱ and μίᾱ). Cf. Mansi X, 992D: "For the Godhead is one in three, as the great theologian Gregory says; and the three—in which is the Godhead or, better, which are the Godhead—are one."
83. (1γ' 5-6) Cf. Mansi X, 992D-E: "And we confess, as one of the holy Trinity, the only begotten Son of God, God the Word, begotten of the Father before all worlds . . . [who] deigned to dwell in the intact womb of the most holy God-bearer and ever-virgin Mary and to be born of her, having united flesh to himself from her womb in one person, having a reasoning and intelligent soul . . ."
84. (1γ' 7) Cf. Mansi X, 993C: "We confess one and the same Son, both God and man, one person."
85. (1γ' 8-9) Mansi X, 993D: "We proclaim that to one and the same belong

both the miracles and the sufferings." The wording is very close.

86. (ιγ'10) Greek θεοτόκος This title of the Virgin was coming into popular devotional use early in the fifth century, and it was Nestorios' rather crude objections to it which aroused the popular wrath against him. It possessed general and official authority after the Council of Ephesus, 431
87. (ιδ'1-2) Luke 1 26-28.
88. (ιδ'5) The concept of the Virgin's intercession is obviously highly developed at this time, cf. stanza xvi also.
89. (ιδ'10-11) Exodus 16 4.
90. (ιε'1) Greek προστάσιαν, that the Virgin is the antecedent is assumed from the over-all subject-matter of the stanza.
91. (ιε'3) Constantinople, literally, "the reigning city."
92. (ιε'4) As ιστ'6 also makes clear, there is more than one emperor at the time of the poem's composition. Heraklios did, in fact, have his two sons associated with him. Constantine III (II) was crowned in infancy (612 or 613), Herakleonas in 638. The poet stresses the emperors' orthodoxy because the safety of the state was felt to depend upon it.
93. (ιε'6-7) Cf. Migne, PG 92, coll. 1348ff., which contain a lection celebrating the deliverance of Constantinople from siege by Persians, Avars and Slavs in 626. "The Patriarch [Sergios] made a circuit of the walls, bearing the icon of Christ not made with hands, the precious and life-giving wood [of the True Cross], and the precious garment of the Mother of God" (col. 1349C-D).
94. (ιστ'3) Dative of instrument. One could understand "intercessions" as an indirect object, but the present translation, which I owe to Professor Trypanis, accords better with the poet's emphasis on the Virgin's powers.
95. (ιστ'4) Greek ἐν τῇ ποιμένι. Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1959), p. 79, also F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1961), section 220
96. (ιστ'6) See p. 14, n. 4
97. (ιστ'10) The description might well fit the destructive Persians, whom Heraklios had finally defeated in 629, but by 640 it was the Moslem Arabs who were "plundering" Christian churches, having conquered Palestine and Syria in 637-38. Their much milder conduct had not yet, apparently, made any impression on their opponents

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

A MONOTHELITE KONTAKION OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY¹

By L. WILLIAM COUNTRYMAN

The anonymous kontakion "On the Holy Fathers"² possesses a particular interest for students of church history as well as for Byzantinists, now that C. A. Trypanis has shown in his introduction to the poem that it is an "heretical" work, written to celebrate the *Ekthesis* of the Emperor Heraklios, fundamental document of the short-lived monothelite theology.

Paul Maas, in 1910, had considered that the poem was early sixth century, perhaps by the great Romanos himself.³ In any case, he believed it to have been written by a contemporary of Romanos and felt that in all probability its composition had preceded that of Romanos' Eastern hymn *Τὸν πρὸ ἡλίου ἥλιον*, which shares the same meter and melody.

Trypanis, however, in his edition of 1968 noted a number of features which called for a much later dating of the poem. They are briefly, as follows: (1) there is reference to the holy robe of the Virgin,⁴ which we know was credited with a role in saving Constantinople from the combined forces of Persians, Avars and Slavs in 626 A.D.; (2) theologically, the poem follows the order of and sometimes uses the exact words of Heraklios' *Ekthesis*, published in 638 at a synod held in Constantinople for its ratification; (3) the lists of heresies condemned in both works are the same; (4) the channels of authority by which the councils are said to act are the same; (5) the poem is inspired by a council contemporary with the author (cf. stanza xi), which, like the council ratifying the *Ekthesis*, is viewed as belonging in the series of Ecumenical Councils.⁵

These arguments provide a *terminus post quem* for the poem of A.D. 638 or 639.⁶ Probably it must have been written very soon thereafter, since the doctrine of "one will" expounded in the *Ekthesis* quickly ran into opposition and was probably repudiated

even by Heraklios himself before his death on February 11, 641. We may thus fix a date of approximately 640, which makes this poem one of the later great kontakia composed in the East. (Other implications of this dating, as they affect the understanding of the poem, will be found in the notes.)

For those readers who are not familiar with the kontakion, it may be well to explain something about this form in order to show why a poem such as this may be highly theological in content and purpose. The Greek kontakion, which took its rise about the end of the fifth century, is essentially a homily in verse, modelled to begin with on the similar, but less ornate Syriac *memrā*. Other Syriac poetic forms also influenced it: from the *madrāšā* it derived more complex meters, a refrain, and an acrostich comprised of the first letter of each stanza; from the *sugīthā* comes a penchant for telling Biblical stories in dialogue form. The Byzantines themselves appear to have added the prooemium (*κουκούλιον*) with which they invariably introduce their kontakia and which is not included in the acrostich.

It is the homiletic character of the kontakion which makes it of particular theological interest; and its Biblical basis often supplies a surprising and intriguing glimpse into Byzantine use and understanding of the Bible.

A word about the music of the kontakion is also in order, since the music was intimately related to the structure of the poems. A kontakion was sung to two separate melodies, one for the prooemium and one for the stanzas (*οἵκοι*). As the meter of the stanzas is apt to be very complex, the first stanza served as a model which the rest followed. Such a model stanza might even serve as the basis for a new composition; and such is in fact the case with the present work, which is based on Romanos' *Τὸν πρὸ ἡλίου ἥλιον*. But even in such instances of imitation, the poet was free to go his own way in regard to the meter and tune of the prooemium; and thus in this kontakion the poem is *ιδιόμελον*, "having its own melody."

The kontakia continue to be used in the Greek church on the feasts for which they were written, though they have been reduced to the prooemium and one or two initial stanzas. To a great extent they were superseded during and after the Iconoclastic period by the poetic form known as the *kanōn*. These kanons are less homiletical, being based rather on the canticles sung at the daily offices. Egon Wellesz has suggested that a revival of regular

preaching made the kontakion redundant.⁷ The continuing elaboration of music in this period was doubtless another factor which promoted the change, for the words of the kanon are more subordinate to the music.

The style of the present kontakion is not unusual, apart from some extraordinary mixing of metaphors.⁸ The language is lofty and strongly Biblical in character. In particular the influence of the Psalms and of I & II Timothy is noticeable. The echoes of the Psalter are not, of course, surprising, since that portion of the Bible became familiar to every clergyman through weekly repetition in the daily offices. The influence of the two epistles to Timothy is perhaps to be explained by the fact that the Pastoral Epistles in general exhibit a strong sense of tradition and even of orthodoxy—elements of particular importance to our author's propagandistic purpose. For whoever he may have been, he wished to emphasize that the Ekthesis and the synods which ratified it were in the tradition of the great ecumenical councils and their doctrine.

For basic stylistic comparisons with Romanos, the reader may consult Maas's edition.

The present article seeks to provide an English translation of this hitherto little known work for the benefit of students of church history and theology and, at the same time, through the translation and its accompanying notes, to elucidate certain difficulties and obscurities in the poem itself. In addition, the Biblical references given in the notes—for which the author does not claim exhaustive completeness—may perhaps form a small contribution to the study of Biblical foundations of early Christian poetic language.

ON THE HOLY FATHERS

PROEM: The church, [guarding] the preaching of the apostles and the doctrines of the fathers, has set her seal⁹ to the one faith. And wearing the garment of truth, which is woven of the heavenly knowledge of God, she rightly handles¹⁰ and glorifies the great mystery of godliness.¹¹

I: Let us listen to God's church as she cries out in her sublime preaching:¹² "Let him who thirsts come to me;¹³ the wine-bowl which I carry is a wine-bowl of wisdom. I have mixed¹⁴ this drink with the word of truth;¹⁵ it pours out not the water of strife,¹⁶ but

of confession.¹⁷ When the present Israel¹⁸ drinks of this confession, it beholds God saying, 'See! See that I am He¹⁹ and I do not change;²⁰ I am God at the beginning and thereafter,²¹ and apart from me there is no other at all.'²² They that partake of this will be filled²³ and will praise the great mystery of godliness."²⁴

- II: I hear of Jericho²⁵ and Siloam²⁶ and the country about Jerusalem with many waters flowing perceptibly. But their waters remain [ed] bad and lifeless until the great Elisha²⁷ healed them, mingling his blessing with salt, making the life-giving power spring up in them by the Spirit.

But here are the greater things. For the church has waters running and leaping forth from this to that²⁸ without flowing, without noise—waters that give life, that make us divine,²⁹ never suffering eclipse, always shining out upon the great mystery of godliness.

- III: The Lord's bride,³⁰ possessing these spiritual symbols³¹ as a divine betrothal, is adorned in many ways. And the spring of these rivers is the Holy Spirit. But know the sources—the conduits and channels, if you will: first apostles, then prophets, thirdly teachers; to these add kinds of tongues, too, as Paul has counted it out.³² For the very merciful Master of the Earth has put these in the church as channels, from which to water the whole circle of the inhabited world, pouring out Spirit upon all whom the great mystery of godliness has illumined.

- IV: Having received the traditions, then, from above—from God and those who are his, the holy church keeps them³³—she who, alone and unique, is confirmed and reigns from one end of the world to the other. For she was founded on a word then when the Word said to Peter,³⁴ "Blessed are you, Simon, because you recognized me as Son of God, for the Father alone revealed this to you from above. And I say to you that you are Peter and on this rock I found my church, which the underworld³⁵ gates will not alter—nor will they hinder the great mystery of godliness."

- V: What he spoke became law; the word appeared as a seal; and the rock remains forever unshaken. Rivers³⁶

and torrents³⁷ of lawlessness have come forth—and all their strength was poured out like water.³⁸ For as much as the faith is attacked, the stronger it becomes, competing always according to rule³⁹ and raising trophies. Where are they⁴⁰ who once spoke against this fold, but did not [succeed in] plunder[ing] it? Men who breathed murder,⁴¹ who were full of trickery, who sharpened their tongues against God?⁴² Has not the Most High winnowed them all, and has not the great mystery of godliness triumphed?

- VI: For you know in what ways Arios⁴³ and the followers of Arios raved against her many times like barking dogs; and they said the Word did not exist before he was begotten,⁴⁴ calling him a creature through whom all things were made,⁴⁵ who was begotten before the morning star,⁴⁶ who called light out of the non-existent⁴⁷ with a word, who shaped man.

Be merciful! Be merciful! Be merciful to all, you that are co-eternal and consubstantial⁴⁸ with the Father!

They dared these things; but they appeared like ashes, swept away to Hades. They have been cut off,⁴⁹ but the great mystery of godliness remains indivisible.⁵⁰

- VII: Thus the divine justice above dealt quickly with the impious one and his blasphemers; and he was not deemed worthy to see the glory of the Lord. For he did not understand, but walked in darkness⁵¹ along with Sabellios⁵² the condemned. For these two evils are contrary to each other,⁵³ but share the same honor in falsehood. For this man, this thrice accursed, spoke of [one] person, three-named, in the Trinity, without making any distinction⁵⁴—and without differing from the madness of the Jews.⁵⁵ The wretch followed them and denied the great mystery of godliness.

- VIII: They fell under this immovable rock—and likewise such as blasphemed after them according to their example, who would not consent to call the Spirit God,⁵⁶ but drew him down into the creation like a slave.

You that are of this graceless madness, how were you liberated?⁵⁷ How, if you do not accept the Spirit who is holy and Lord? Whence is the adoption as sons given

you?⁵⁸ Consider, and answer. For if you deny [the Spirit] you have fallen from this [adoption], deprived of the One who gave it. But as for us, we know the Spirit as our God and we glorify the great mystery of godliness.

IX: Though the church of God receives many a shock⁵⁹ from great waves, as has been said, it has not been shaken, but has grown stronger and remains firmly established. For others, again, attacked in various ways, wishing to trouble and shake the ineffable mystery of Christ's coming and his generous concession.⁶⁰ Some of these secretly introduced a denial of the flesh,⁶¹ others of the divinity.⁶² And they dared to say that he who walked on the sea⁶³ was a mere man. Many are the storms, then, from various directions, which the great mystery of godliness has stilled.⁶⁴

X:⁶⁵ On account of all these things, the holy fathers, assembling at the proper times,⁶⁶ like shepherds of the sheep⁶⁷ cut out the bitter weeds⁶⁸ and led the sheep to the sweet grass. They barred⁶⁹ all the entryways so that no wolf⁷⁰ or other evil thing might come in and a sheep be lost. These [men], then, shot with their anathemas as with a sling at the leaders of the heresies; and the orthodox people and the feet of the priests trampled them. For we have stood by what is right and we proclaim the great mystery of godliness.

[Xbis: On account of all these things, therefore, grace gathered together at their proper times the five councils⁷¹ of the fathers—the same in number as our senses—and made the knowledge of truth plain through them. And again [grace] gathered yet another council here against Severos,⁷² enemy of the orthodox faith. These [councils] shot with their anathemas as if with a sling at these leaders of heresies—one of whom was this Severos, the common receptacle of all filthiness. For he stirred up everything and mixed all together; he worked harm to the great mystery of godliness.]

XI: Some of God's Spirit which was in Moses was given, as it is written, to seventy elders,⁷³ so that they might take up cases along with him who brought that people out [of Egypt] and led them. But now there is given to

the god-bearing fathers the grace which the holy apostles received from heaven.⁷⁴ While this [council] was in session,⁷⁵ then, they received [it] and made the divine sayings plain, leading the people, dispersing error,⁷⁶ and establishing the inhabited world without turbulence or shocks, having guarded⁷⁷ the great mystery of godliness as they had received it.

XII: We marvel at Daniel because he passed judgment and exposed the shame of the two old men.⁷⁸ But we marvel more at these fathers, for they condemned the priests of the shame, having saved not just one Susanna but many, whom Paul had betrothed to the one Christ as one [bride]⁷⁹—I mean the souls of those who believe on the Lord, who governs our breath and cries out to all, "Let him who wishes to follow me not stumble."⁸⁰ For I am the eternal light, without any evening, out of which the great mystery of godliness has shone."

XIII:⁸¹ In heaven and on earth one choir is brought to perfection; a harmony of angels and men is welded together. In one Trinity the Godhead is praised,⁸² and in unity the divine Trinity is glorified. And him who was incarnate of the Virgin we acknowledge as truly one of the Trinity,⁸³ himself God and man.⁸⁴ His alike, we say, are both the sufferings and the miracles⁸⁵—the chief of which is the child-bearing of Mary, for which she is hymned as God-bearer⁸⁶ by the whole world. For by magnifying her, we are saved, by learning the great mystery of godliness.

XIV: She heard Gabriel's word of joy as he spoke and cried out to her, "Hail, highly favored one."⁸⁷ And as she gave birth, she at once took away our griefs. And when we fall again into wailing and sorrow, she quickly bows in intercession⁸⁸—says in prayer to him who was born of her, "My Son, my God, and my Creator, you became man for the sake of men; and I bore and nursed the One who exists before all things, who rained bread from the heavens on the people in the desert."⁸⁹ Now then, O supremely Good, have pity on those to whom you have given the great mystery of godliness."

XV: We all as Christians have her as protection⁹⁰—a wall

in wars and a calm in dangers, but especially the royal city:⁹¹ first, because faithful men rule over her;⁹² then, because she is exceedingly pious. And she guards the precious robe of the God-bearer by which especially she is protected;⁹³ and she says, "O Lady, keep me ever as a child in the shelter of your hands, just as you have already thwarted swords and not thrust my prayer aside. You turned my enemies away; and those who persecuted the great mystery of godliness have fled."

XVI: And you, Most High God, born of a Virgin, the only ruler, both of things above and things below, you that always show favor through⁹⁴ her intercessions, you that pasture your sheep as⁹⁵ an innocent shepherd—deliver your people from every necessity. Give victories to the emperors⁹⁶ and lasting peace to your dominions. Ransom, O Lord, the churches which unclean feet have trampled and men of blood,⁹⁷ who have not hoped in your name, have plundered. Search out the blood of your servants and vindicate the great mystery of godliness.

FOOTNOTES

1. This article would not have been possible without the advice, assistance and encouragement of C. A. Trypanis, generously given.
2. Greek text published by Paul Maas, *Frühbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie* (Bonn, 1910) and by C. A. Trypanis, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* ("Wiener Byzantinistische Studien," V; Vienna, 1968). In some manuscripts the kontakion has the title "On the (318) Holy Fathers of the Council of Nicaea"; but this is belied both by the acrostich, which reads simply "on [the] holy fathers" and also by the theological content of the poem, which clearly goes well beyond Nicaea. All councils to the time of the author are celebrated.
3. Anciently regarded as inventor of the kontakion form, and generally regarded as its greatest practitioner.
4. Stanza xv.
5. See notes to the present translation for further discussion of each of these points. For detailed support of them, see Trypanis, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90.
6. When a second council was held for the same purpose.

7. Egon Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1961), pp. 202-04.
8. Cf. stanzas ii and iii.
9. (Proem 2) I.e. "attested"; cf. John 3:33. (The numbers in parentheses at the head of each footnote refer to the lines of the Greek text).
10. (Proem 5) II Tim. 2:15.
11. (Proem 5) "The great mystery of godliness," I Tim. 3:16; cf. 3:9. This phrase forms a refrain throughout the poem, carefully incorporated each time into the sentence structure of the line preceding. It is no easier, however, to define the precise meaning of the phrase here than in the Biblical passage from which it derives. At times it means the "revealed truth about God" (Proem, stanzas iii, xii, xiii, xiv), specifically orthodox doctrine (vii, viii, x, xi). At other times it seems to refer rather to the organized and established expression of that truth, i.e. the Orthodox Church (ii, iv, v, vi, [x], xv, xvi). In one instance it perhaps refers to the Eucharist (i); in another it may mean God himself (ix).
12. (α'1) Prov. 9:3 LXX.
13. (α'2) John 7:37.
14. (α'4) Prov. 9:2.
15. (α'4) II Timothy 2:15; cf. p. 4, n. 2.
16. (α'5) I.e. the "Waters of Mara"; Num 20:13.
17. (α'6) I Tim. 6:12. "Strife" and "confession" form a paronomasia in the Greek: ἀντιλογία...ὁμολογία.
18. (α'6) I.e. the new Israel.
19. (α'9) Isa. 41:4; cf. 43:10.
20. (α'9) Mal. 3:6.
21. (α'10) Isa. 41:4; cf. 44:6.
22. (α'11) Isa. 45:5, 6, 21.
23. (α'12) Cf. Luke 1:53.
24. The entire first stanza has reference to the Eucharist, the second to Baptism.
25. (β'1-6) II Kings 2:19-22.
26. (β'1) John 9:7.
27. (β'1-6) II Kings 2:19-22.
28. (β'10) Psalm 74:9 (75:8) LXX. The phrase "from this to that" is oddly weak in so emphatic and effusive a passage; it can only be understood as acquiring a certain force from its familiar Biblical context. The LXX of Psalm 74:8-9a may be translated thus: "For God is judge; he humbles **this** man and exalts **that** one. There is a cup of unmixed wine in the Lord's hand, full of mixture; and it bends **from this to that**." Thus the phrase has a strong connotation of "from humiliation to exaltation."
29. (β'11) Baptism. Perhaps compare John 10:34.
30. (γ'2) The church. Eph. 5:2-32.
31. (γ'1) The two sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.
32. (γ'7) I Cor. 12:28. Part of Paul's list is omitted by the poet, only the first

32 THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

three and the last terms being given. It is hard to say what relevance the author found in the mention of "tongues," which were hardly a feature of church life in his day. Perhaps he thought of them, in the light of Acts 2 5-11, as a gift of language necessary to missionary preaching.

33. (δ'2) II Thess. 2 15.
34. (δ'6-12) Matthew 16 17-18.
35. (δ'12) The Biblical passage has "the gates of Hades," a more natural expression.
36. (ε'3) Matthew 7 25.
37. (ε'3) Psalm 17 5 (18 4).
38. (ε'4) Psalm 21 15 (22 14).
39. (ε'6) II Tim. 2 5.
40. (ε'8) Compare the Arian song recorded in Socrates VI 8, 2 "Where are they who say that the three are one power?"
41. (ε'10) Acts 9 1.
42. (ε'11) Psalm 63 4 (64 3).
43. (στ1) Arius, who taught that the Word was a creature and not truly God, was condemned at the First Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325—the first of the five councils commemorated in this kontakion.
44. (στ'3) A favorite Arian slogan ran "There was when he was not", i.e. the Son, unlike the Father, had a beginning and was not eternal.
45. (στ'4) John 1 3.
46. (στ'5) Psalm 109 (110) 3 LXX.
47. (στ'6) Cf. Romans 4 17 as well as Gen. 1 3.
48. (στ'9) The key word accepted at Nicaea to exclude Arian notions of a basic difference in nature between Father and Son.
49. (στ'12) Cf. Psalm 34 (35) 15 LXX.
50. (στ'12) Probably "incapable of being split by heresy", indeed, the Greek word here (ἀδιάρητον) is related to our word "heresy."
51. (ζ'4) Isa. 9 2 (9 1 LXX).
52. (ζ'5) Sabellios, who flourished under Pope Kallistos I (217-22) and was eventually excommunicated by him, taught that the distinctions among the three persons of the Trinity were purely modal, not essential or enduring. His heresy preceded that of Arius by a century, his inclusion **after** Arius in the kontakion may reflect the fact that some extremists among the supporters of Nicaea (e.g. Marcellos of Ancyra) were labelled "Sabellians." The First Council of Constantinople (381) condemned Sabellianism, as its synodical letter shows.
53. (ζ'6) Sabellios' teaching was "contrary" to that of Arius in the sense that it recognized no real distinction between Father and Son, while Arius held to a radical difference of nature between them. It is noteworthy that Arius and Sabellios are the two heretics singled out in the main body of the **Ekthesis** (Mansi X, 992D), the others attacked in this kontakion are merely listed at the end (996D-E).
54. (ζ'10) I.e. among the three persons.
55. (ζ'11) Because of his exclusive emphasis on the **unity** of the godhead. The

language is astonishing, not so much because of its regrettable, but familiar anti-Jewish tone as because it seems to dismiss the whole Biblical witness to monotheism!

56. (η'3) The Pneumatomachi, often called "Macedonians" after 380, although there is no evidence that Macedonios of Constantinople held to their opinions. They accepted the consubstantiality of Son with Father, but not that of the Holy Spirit. Their leader was Eustathios of Sebaste. They were condemned at the First Council of Constantinople, 381.
57. (η'6) Cf. Romans 8:2, "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has liberated me from the law of sin and death."
58. (η'8) Cf. Romans 8:15, "You received the Spirit of adoption." Hence the Spirit and the adoption are conceived as inseparable by the poet; he who rejects the one rejects the other.
59. (θ'1) Cf. Luke 21:25. The church is apparently conceived here as a ship; compare the last sentence of the stanza, with its echo of Christ's stilling of the waters.
60. (θ'6) The word *οἰκονομία* is difficult to translate. In accordance with New Testament usage (cf. Eph. 3:9), it might mean "plan of salvation" here; but the passage seems to accord better with the later, ecclesiastical usage of the word, where it signifies an authoritative exemption from normal rules for the sake of charity. The whole incarnation is here summed up in one word as a gracious and entirely unmerited act of generosity on God's part.
61. (θ'8) The phrase "denial of the flesh" fits most readily the second-century tendency to Docetism—that is, rejection of any notion that the divine Son could have suffered in a human body; either the body was a mirage or else the divine was not really united to it. Here, however, I think the poet is referring in a veiled way to the doctrine of Eutyches, the Monophysite teacher condemned at Chalcedon (451). Eutyches was reluctant to say that the Incarnate Lord was "consubstantial with us" (though he would say that he took flesh from the Virgin who was consubstantial with us). His opponents interpreted his rejection of the phrase as a revived Docetism. (See J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* [2nd ed.; New York, 1960], pp. 332-33.)

As an attack on Monophysite doctrine, the line is certainly both obscure and weak—especially as compared with the poet's more forceful attacks on Arius, Sabellios and the Pneumatomachi. Undoubtedly this sudden failure of clarity was dictated by the circumstances of the kontakion's composition, for the *Ekthesis* was meant precisely to conciliate the Monophysites. Still, the poet could not omit them entirely from his list of heresies, for Chalcedon was still to be recognized among the authentic general councils.

62. (θ'9) Once again, the obvious reference is to much earlier heresies—Ebionism (a Jewish-Christian sect), the second-century Adoptionism of Theodotos and Artemon, and above all the teachings of Paul of Samosata, condemned at the synod of Antioch in 268. All taught that Jesus was a human being exceptionally endowed with divine inspiration. (Kelly, pp. 117-18, 139-40.) We must see in this "denial of divinity," however, a reference to Nestorios, who had objected to the honoring of the Virgin as

θεοτόκος ("God-bearer") on the ground that she was only the bearer of the particular man Jesus. Nestorios did not, in fact, deny the intimate and indissoluble incarnation of the Son in Christ; but his opponents interpreted his teaching in that way, some (e.g. Eusebios of Dorylaeum) even accusing him of Adoptionism (Kelly, p. 311.) Nestorios was condemned at the Council of Ephesos, 431.

Here as above when referring to the Monophysites, the poet treads carefully. While the Nestorians proper were not within the purview of the *Ekthesis* and were therefore open to attack, many Monophysites regarded Chalcedonian orthodoxy as *de facto* Nestorian. It was not, therefore, in accord with the irenic intent of the *Ekthesis* for the poet to use *any* of the current labels deriving from Christological controversy.

63. (θ'11) Matthew 14:26.
64. (θ'12) Mark 4:37-39.
65. Maas prints the secondary version of stanza X first and numbers the original "ι'bis." I follow Trypanis in printing the original first and numbering the later addition "ι'bis." Maas and Trypanis agree that the present is the original tenth stanza. The acrostich does not allow for more than one of the two and, in any case, they are obvious duplicates.
66. (ι'1) This phrase, along with the theological content of the preceding stanzas, makes it clear that more than one council forms the subject of the poem. It is a celebration of all general councils.
67. (ι'2) Cf. Heb. 13:20.
68. (ι'3) That is, the heretics were excommunicated and their teachings anathematized. The language derives from the parable of the Wheat and Tares (Matt. 13:24-30); in the explanation of the parable (vss. 36-43) Jesus explains the weeds as "the sons of the Evil One."
69. (ι'5) "Barred"—literally, "fenced with a palisade."
70. (ι'6) Cf. Acts 20:29.
71. (ι'bis 2) Presumably the first five general councils: I Nicaea (325); I Constantinople (381); Ephesos (431); Chalcedon (451); II Constantinople (553).
72. (ι'bis 6) Severos (c. 465-538) had been Patriarch of Antioch, 512-518, but was deposed as a heretic. He "became the eloquent exponent of Monophysitism in his famous theological discourses" (Aziz S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* [London, 1968], pp. 72-73).

It would be most natural, in view of the vehemence of this stanza, to suppose that the council in question was the synod which excommunicated Severos in 536 at Constantinople; but if that is the case, what list of *five* councils is intended at the beginning of the stanza? We must rather look for some posthumous condemnation of Severos at a synod later than 553. The synod of 638 at Constantinople, by ratifying the *Ekthesis*, did in fact anathematize Severos (Mansi X, 996E).

Trypanis (p. 91, n. 22) deduces that this spurious strophe is very nearly as old as the poem itself. The vehemence of feeling evident in it is to be explained by the fact that "Severian" was a common equivalent for "Monophysite" in the early seventh century; see Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church* (Edinburgh, 1896), V, pp. 4-6.

The spurious stanza must emanate from a circle which opposed reunion with the "Severians" or else have been written as it became clear that the **Ekthesis** had failed of its purpose.

73. (1α' 1-2) Num. 11:16f., 25.
74. (1α' 5-7) This grace is clearly understood as superior to that received by Moses' elders; no doubt a reference to Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4) is intended.
75. (1α' 7) Probably the poet made no distinction between the synods of 638 and 639, which were, in fact, devoted to the same item of business—ratification and promulgation of the **Ekthesis**. The claim that these synods belong in the tradition of General Councils is very clear here and recalls the reverence for the Five Councils expressed in the **Ekthesis** itself.
76. (1α' 10) Cf. Eusebios, *H. E.* IV 24, where the bishops are represented in very similar language as driving off heresy.
77. (1α' 12) Cf. the phrase τὴν παραθήκην φυλάσσειν, "to guard the deposit of faith," in I Tim. 6:20, II Tim. 1:12-14.
78. (1β' 1-2) The apocryphal prologue to Daniel contains the story of Susanna and the elders.
79. (1β' 6-7) Although the quotation is far from exact, the reference must be to II Cor. 11:2. The "many Susannas" are the Christian believers joined together in the one church, which is Christ's bride.
80. (1β' 11) John 11:9-10.
81. Stanza xiii contains the entire positive theological statement of the kontakion; as such it counters all the heresies listed in stanzas vi-ix with the corresponding orthodox doctrines. The passage also follows closely the (much longer and more diffuse) doctrinal declarations of the **Ekthesis** (Greek text in J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Florence, 1759f., X, 992-97; for an English translation of the most pertinent passages see Hefele, V, 62-64). It is surprising that there is no positive assertion of the doctrine of the One Will itself, but it is to that happy omission that we owe the poem's preservation. Was the poet less than whole-heartedly in favor of the Emperor's theological project? Or was it felt that the best line of propaganda was to stay away from theological argumentation and stress the authority of the council which promulgated the doctrine?
82. (1γ' 3-4) Or perhaps "The one Godhead is praised in Trinity" (reading μίᾱ and μίᾱ). Cf. Mansi X, 992D: "For the Godhead is one in three, as the great theologian Gregory says; and the three—in which is the Godhead or, better, which are the Godhead—are one."
83. (1γ' 5-6) Cf. Mansi X, 992D-E: "And we confess, as one of the holy Trinity, the only begotten Son of God, God the Word, begotten of the Father before all worlds . . . [who] deigned to dwell in the intact womb of the most holy God-bearer and ever-virgin Mary and to be born of her, having united flesh to himself from her womb in one person, having a reasoning and intelligent soul . . ."
84. (1γ' 7) Cf. Mansi X, 993C: "We confess one and the same Son, both God and man, one person."
85. (1γ' 8-9) Mansi X, 993D: "We proclaim that to one and the same belong

both the miracles and the sufferings." The wording is very close.

86. (ιγ'10) Greek θεοτόκος This title of the Virgin was coming into popular devotional use early in the fifth century, and it was Nestorios' rather crude objections to it which aroused the popular wrath against him. It possessed general and official authority after the Council of Ephesus, 431
87. (ιδ'1-2) Luke 1 26-28.
88. (ιδ'5) The concept of the Virgin's intercession is obviously highly developed at this time, cf. stanza xvi also.
89. (ιδ'10-11) Exodus 16 4.
90. (ιε'1) Greek προστάσιαν, that the Virgin is the antecedent is assumed from the over-all subject-matter of the stanza.
91. (ιε'3) Constantinople, literally, "the reigning city."
92. (ιε'4) As ιστ'6 also makes clear, there is more than one emperor at the time of the poem's composition. Heraklios did, in fact, have his two sons associated with him. Constantine III (II) was crowned in infancy (612 or 613), Herakleonas in 638. The poet stresses the emperors' orthodoxy because the safety of the state was felt to depend upon it.
93. (ιε'6-7) Cf. Migne, PG 92, coll. 1348ff., which contain a lection celebrating the deliverance of Constantinople from siege by Persians, Avars and Slavs in 626. "The Patriarch [Sergios] made a circuit of the walls, bearing the icon of Christ not made with hands, the precious and life-giving wood [of the True Cross], and the precious garment of the Mother of God" (col. 1349C-D).
94. (ιστ'3) Dative of instrument. One could understand "intercessions" as an indirect object, but the present translation, which I owe to Professor Trypanis, accords better with the poet's emphasis on the Virgin's powers
95. (ιστ'4) Greek ἐν τῇ ποιμένι. Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1959), p. 79, also F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1961), section 220
96. (ιστ'6) See p. 14, n. 4
97. (ιστ'10) The description might well fit the destructive Persians, whom Heraklios had finally defeated in 629, but by 640 it was the Moslem Arabs who were "plundering" Christian churches, having conquered Palestine and Syria in 637-38. Their much milder conduct had not yet, apparently, made any impression on their opponents

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE NOTION OF HISTORICITY AND THE CRITICAL STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT *

By GEORGES BARROIS

The historicity of the Bible, a locution deceptively simple in appearance, involves in reality many complex judgments of fact and of value. Used without sufficient discretion, as it happened in many popular handbooks, it leads often to massive affirmations or negations generating more heat than light. My purpose here is to bring it into better focus, by figuring out what historicity means, and by applying the fruit of my reflection to Old Testament studies.

A definition by *genus* and *species* might pre-empt our conclusions. It will be probably better to start from an empirical description of historicity, based on concrete elements of the historical process. I would propose this, subject to further clarification: historicity is that particular quality of documents relative to past events and physical or psychological facts, inasmuch as the memory of such, at first unrecorded, subsequently consigned in writing and eventually gathered in compilations of diverse age, worth and purpose, forms the subject-matter of history.

A capital remark has to be made at this point: facts themselves cannot be described as historical or un-historical. This is a shortened way of speaking. What is properly and primarily historical is the record of such facts in written documents or epigraphic documents. By extension, uninscribed monuments and objects may be considered as accessory to the historical process. On the basis of the material thus gathered and tested, the historian tries to infer what has happened in the past, how, when, why, and whether it seems to have conditioned or determined the so-called "course of history."

We should not overlook, however, that the historian's knowledge of the past is not, and cannot be, coextensive with what actually happened, nor how it did happen. The historical past is

only a part of the total past. Things did happen that are not traceable, either of themselves or, temporarily, for actual lack of clues. The fact and the how of such occurrences may eventually be assumed with greater or lesser probability, at least on an hypothetical basis, but they are not receivable as material evidence in the court of history. I am thinking, by way of illustration, of tombstones in Brittany: "N . . . , Perdu en mer (lost at sea)." The only thing certain is that N . . . sailed out of Paimpol, or Cancale, and did not return. His death is bound to remain hypothetical, until the sea gives back the body of N . . . , and they lay him to rest in the little churchyard. Another example might be taken from the missing link in the evolution of a species, or from a developmental phase, still to be discovered, in a biological chain.

Our first problem, therefore, is one of method: how can we best deal with the documentation at our disposal, that we may reach valid conclusions? What help may we receive from kindred disciplines, such as anthropology, archaeology, sociology and economic or political sciences, which can throw an indirect, but always welcome light, on the path of the historian? And what are the natural limitations of the historical enterprise? We must not demand of history what it cannot possibly give, because of the very nature of the historical process, or of the particular difficulty of a given problem. It should be obvious that history will never yield an iron clad demonstration of Christian faith or a justification of the dogma.

It is generally understood that two preliminary procedures are indispensable for writing history: first, a critical examination of the documents from a formal point of view: textual criticism, age and origin of the sources, identification of authors, editors and compilers, stylistic patterns, and the like. The second procedure, hermeneutics proper, viz. the interpretation of the documents, aims at evaluating contents in relation to the historical context, at determining what the source documents meant for their contemporaries and how they were understood by later generations, at observing the evolution, the deviations, and eventually the vanishing of traditions. Critical analysis and interpretation of the documents should never be separated nor isolated from each other; rather they interlock, even though theoreticians of historical methodology may differ in appraising their mutual relationship.

I may be permitted to trace the development of historical methods by excerpting from three modern treatises, admittedly picked at random from a library shelf. The first one is the well-

known *Introduction to the Study of History*, written in close collaboration by two prominent French scholars, Ch. V. Langlois and Ch. Seignobos, translated into English by G. G. Berry in 1898, and re-edited many times.¹ The book, intended as a Manual for the students of the Sorbonne and of the Ecole Normale, has become a classic and, so to speak, the Bible of historical methodology for generations of scholars. It is still quoted as an epoch-making contribution to historical science. The general emphasis is on what has been sneeringly described as "battle history," which refers to such obvious facts as dynastic changes, revolutions, wars, peace treatises and covenants, most of the time abundantly documented by official instruments, chancery records, or private relations and Memoires. We may note that, about that time, the German historians were trying to extend their research to the broader field, but less sharply defined, of the history of culture (*Kulturgeschichte*), and its varieties. The Manual insists on the necessity of submitting the historical documentation to negative criticism, in order to test its receivability, for a reasonable amount of critical doubt is essential to the method.

"An historian fails in criticism when he neglects to distinguish between documents, when he never mistrusts traditional ascriptions, and when he accepts, as if afraid to lose a single one, all the pieces of information, ancient or modern, good or bad, which come to him, from whatever quarter We must not, however, be satisfied with this form of criticism, and we must not abuse of it The extreme of distrust, in these matters, is almost as mischievous as the extreme of credulity."²

Indispensable as it is, negative criticism is only preparatory, limited in scope, and cannot be expected to yield any positive information amounting to certitude, but only to a greater or lesser probability. The final aim of criticism is

" . . . to get rid of documents which are not documents, and which would have misled us; that is all Criticism merely destroys illusory sources of information; it supplies nothing certain to take their place. The only sure results of criticism are negative. All the positive results are subject to doubt; they reduce to propositions of the form: there are chances for or against the truth of such and such a statement. Chances only."³

Having thus cleared the way by means of negative criticism, the

historian now proceeds guardedly to a search of the past for causes or explanations, and should be ready to build up. The rigorism of historical criticism à la Langlois-Seignobos guarantees unimpeachable conclusions, yet we cannot help feeling that they suffer from an unjustified minimalism. Their method makes little or no allowance for imponderable quantities stubbornly resisting any kind of regimentation and not receivable as historical evidence strictly speaking, yet offering precious information to the historian. Our authors work principally on the basis of records relative to physical, external facts and events easily pinned down, but history has to deal also with psychological facts and developments more difficult to identify, record, or interpret. Furthermore, valuable sources are left untapped, because they are deemed marginal or extraneous to history in a narrow sense. And here is precisely where the "Langlois-Seignobos" shows its age: the study of social, religious, economic phenomena, of folklore, myths and legends, the scientific measuring of public opinion, still in infancy or yet to be born, did not or could not figure on official academic programs. They would have met, anyway, with more than suspicion on the part of our two scholars, just as whatever seemed to involve an appeal to transcendental causes, Providence or its equivalent, was curtly dismissed by them as "metaphysics," a category unwelcome to Auguste Comte and the positivists, whose ideology reigned over the Sorbonne. Incidentally, it is as good as dead in contemporary Europe, but many an American campus is still affected by some sort of hangover.

A second book, *History, its Purpose and Method*, by G. J. Renier, a Dutchman (the name suggests a French Huguenot descent), Professor in the University of London, was first published in 1950. Renier stands resolutely by the principles of Langlois-Seignobos, whom he quotes approvingly, sharing their views on the necessity of keeping historical methods "clean," and excluding deliberately from the historical agenda sociology and philosophy of history. In his eyes, such an exclusion

"... is more than a matter of methodological convenience. To grant these subjects rights of citizenship within our discipline would alter its texture and its function. Sociology . . . is a humanistic science, a systematization of observations made by men about men. All such disciplines remain subjective in their generalizations; their syntheses are influenced by the temperament, the antecedents, the outlook of those who practice them."⁴

Yet, by a happy in consequence, Renier takes sharp exception with the theory according to which the historian ought to remain totally unbiased and express no personal views; such detachment, in his opinion, is neither possible nor desirable, as it would mean a deliberate self-mutilation. With this we concur most heartily, as when, at a few pages of distance, we catch him in the very act of "philosophizing," an activity, eminently "subjective," which he deprecates, but which, in the present case, yields unexpected dividends.

"If we believe that there are in the human past perceptible regularities of occurrence which the historian can formulate and use as tools for telling his story, we believe, by implication, that the historian's world, the human past, can be understood by him, that it is intelligible, and that, figuratively speaking, it is reasonable Once we believe in this intelligibility, we are entitled to assume that the human past cannot be mere chaos."⁵

Now this comes singularly close to something that resembles neither a blind fate, nor a succession of fortuitous occurrences, but rather presupposes an orientation, an ordering of facts and events, no matter what the principle, or principles, of such an order may be. Being carried to the limit, would this not spell "Providence"?

The third book from which I would quote is Morton White's *Foundation of Historical Knowledge*, published in 1965. The author, a Professor of philosophy at Harvard, is concerned with the epistemology of the notion of causality, as applied to historical phenomenology, and investigated according to the method of analytical philosophy. From this standpoint, it is obvious that considerations as to the ultimate *telos*, or a search for the First Cause, must remain out of bounds for history as such, that is, beyond the range of historical inquiry.⁶ Most valuable in Morton White's book is the analytical testing of causal and non-causal explanations, rational or non-rational, essential causes and causes contributory. From this examination, the author concludes to the un-typical use of the notion of causality by historians, which makes it futile to place the historical process on par with the so-called "exact" sciences. Similarly, any monistic justification for historical occurrences, as would be an all-out mechanistic hypothesis, an all-out economic, or political, or ecological explanation, is rejected.

"To adopt a monistic theory of the explanation . . . in any branch of history, is as indefensible as to adopt one in the law. It is much like saying that automobile accidents are always to be explained by reference to the icy condition of the road . . . or to the drunkenness of the driver . . . or to faulty brakes. An advocate of Marxism or psychoanalysis may of course collect statistics comparable to those collected by insurance companies . . . But such statistics would not eliminate the need for studying each case individually."⁷

This eliminates radically a univocal conception of history, and opens broader prospects than the overly restricted methodology of positivism, without threatening the validity of conclusions drawn from well-balanced criticism and hermeneutics. The adjective "historical" is polyvalent: there are historical facts and events, historical traditions, historical trends of thought, historical methods of interpreting or representing the facts or events of the past. The notion of historicity applies proportionally to the various quantities we call historical, and which, in one way or another, are legitimate objects of history.

I pass now to the second part of this article, and I shall try to show how our conception of the historical method affects the study of the Old Testament. As could be expected, the development of Biblical scholarship during the past seventy-five years parallels the evolution of historical methodology. The critical method advocated by the early theoreticians of history, moved as they were by positivistic and kindred ideologies, inspired the concern of western theologians for "re-visiting" the Bible, and especially the Old Testament. They reacted against the stagnation of Biblical scholarship among Christians and Jews alike. Protestant radicals, eager to free themselves from the fetters of tradition, rejected or by-passed the claims of the Bible to be an inspired writing and the authentic record of Divine Revelation. The Old Testament had to be put in its place as just a piece of eastern literature, and Biblical religion as just one more Semitic religion. These were the days of Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel*, and of the critical *post-mortem* of the Pentateuch, the dissection of which was recorded graphically in the color-printed sheets of Haupt's "Rainbow Bible." Roman Catholic scholars countered by trying to use the critical method constructively, in order to buttress, rather than to batter, the traditional positions, and to open new avenues for a better understanding of the Scriptures committed to the Church. A certain apologetic overtone is easily detected in

Fr. Lagrange's *La méthode historique*, which met, alas, with suspicion and even undisguised hostility on the part of ultra-conservative elements in the Roman curia, and in the Roman Catholic Church at large.⁸

These battles had been fought on the terrain of Biblical criticism as such. Meanwhile, the need for a renovated hermeneutics was felt by all. The search goes on. Orthodox theologians have taken the initiative to investigate systematically the principles of interpretation which the Bible itself suggests and which guided the Church Fathers. A number of Roman Catholic scholars are working independently toward similar objectives, witness the publication of such series as the scholarly *Sources Chrétiennes*, or the more popular American collections.

A wise application of the historical method to the study of Scripture and Patristics should contribute greatly toward laying a solid foundation for hermeneutics, and ultimately toward deciding what, from a Christian standpoint, must be regarded as relevant or normative, a decision of which history is indeed an essential factor, but which, short of Christian faith, lies beyond the grasp of human endeavour. In fact, however, hermeneutics, in the hands of a majority of independent and Protestant scholars, is in a bewildering disarray. The reason for this seems to be their conscious disregard or total rejection of tradition as a guiding principle, and their attempt at building up a science of hermeneutics on a variety of philosophical (at times, alas, sophomoric!) ideologies and methods, such as Hegelianism and its derivatives, modernistic symbolism, demythologizing, desacralizing, an intemperate use of linguistic analysis raised to the level of a panacea, or the application of a wild, nihilistic variety of the theory of literary forms (*Formgeschichte*).

After this overlong excursus on the status of Old Testament scholarship, I shall limit myself to considering the following problem: granted that the notion of historicity, as we have tried to describe it, is not to be understood as univocal, but as polyvalent, and seeing that the Bible, as we read it today, is a collection of various pieces of inspired Scriptures, then how or on which grounds can the traditional sections of the Old Testament, *Torah*, *Nebhiim*, and *Ketubhim*, be called "historical"? More precisely, which items in the sacred page, either directly or indirectly expressed, qualify as historical records of the Divine Revelation, and from which standpoints can they be ascribed the note of historicity? In the last sentence, the adjective historical must be

underscored. The task that lies before us is emphatically not that we should distinguish in the Holy Scriptures elements inspired, and consequently authoritative, from statements non inspired: the charism of inspiration makes it that everything in Scripture is, in some way or other, instrumental to the total Revelation of the Christian mystery, but not everything is susceptible to be scrutinized through the historical inquiry, which remains essentially limited in scope and method.

Opening the Book of Genesis, I would distinguish the following categories: Creation narratives, history of the origins (*Urgeschichte*), and Patriarchal history. It is obvious that the Creation narratives, viz. the Hexaemeron, the creation of man in Eden, the Creator's rest on the seventh day, the fall and expulsion from Paradise, cannot possibly be regarded as historical by modern standards, which does not mean that they have no real substance. To begin with, no witness can be called, no document produced; but here is not the problem. Literary criticism has established the affinity of these narratives with early cosmogonies and mythological poems of the Near and Middle East, and it appears that the author, or authors, of the Book of Genesis, made use of this common-domain material, demythologized it, and made it into a vehicle for expressing what they believed to be God's revelation to mankind, namely that He is the God who called all things into existence and due order through His Word; that He breathed from His Spirit into every living thing; that He created the first human couple in His likeness; that He called all men to partake of His own blessedness; that He tested the free obedience of man and it was found wanting, and that He did override evil by the promise of a Savior from the seed of Adam—the Protevangel in the initial pages of the Bible, Now these are the headlines of the original Paradosis, substantiated, clarified, and implemented in all the subsequent Biblical records. Precisely in these lies the traditional material out of which we can write the religious history of the Hebrew people, rather than build up easy, and deceiving, syncretisms on the basis of common literary formulae.

The same can be assumed of the history of origins (*Urgeschichte*), which tells the story of all the "first's": the first murder, the first musicians, the first iron smith, the first act of retributive justice (by way of vengeance!), all these as imagined in popular speculations on the progress or failures of the human race. We may note here a partial demythologization of the corresponding Oriental folklore, according to which the arts and skills of

men were ascribed a divine origin.⁹ Now we should beware lest we confuse the history of origins with human paleontology or pre-historic anthropology. This would amount to concordism, and concordism, either naive or sophisticated, leads generally nowhere, and often betrays the very purpose of Scripture, which is to instruct us in righteousness (2 Tim. 3:16), and not into erudition. Of course, every partial truth, no matter how it is won, will, in last analysis, resolve into the ultimate Truth. Biblical truth, Biblical history, must not be kept incommunicado from scientific truth firmly established by proper methods, but we are wary of short-circuiting the process of integration of truth by premature connections. We wonder whether Teilhard de Chardin's romantic vision of a universe oriented toward his famous Omega point, where the "Cosmic Christ" shall be all in all, should not represent an ingenious variety of sophisticated concordism. At any rate, it has done much to provoke malevolent accusations of confusion of perspectives, universalism, pantheistic monism, and to embarrass Teilhard's friends and fellow Jesuits.

The historicity of the Patriarchal narratives is of a different order. The legend of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his sons, eponyms of the tribes of Israel,¹⁰ belongs in a literary category with which modern Orientalists have long been familiar, but which seems to have been neglected or ignored as estraneous to "scientific" history. It consists of biographical fragments giving a vivid picture of the personality of tribal chieftains, whose down-to-earth individual features and reactions to environment and circumstances appear in bold relief. At the same time, in pure Bedouin fashion, their genealogies reflect a social setup in which blood-ties are of primary importance; these genealogies double as a framework for the history of the tribes. The general trustworthiness of the traditions is well established, internally, by the consistency and essential agreement of episodes recorded sometimes in duplicate or triplicate from different perspectives. Modern critics are used to base their distinction of early documents or sources of the Book of Genesis, such as J, the Yahwistic source, and E, the Elohist, originating, the former in Judah, the latter in the northern districts of Palestine, on the characteristic differences exhibited by these narratives, their particular emphasis, their vocabulary, local color, and intended objectives. Such distinctions within the Book could be explained equally well, and perhaps even better, in reference to the various sanctuaries of the Patriarchal

period, Shechem, Bethel, Mamrê-Hebron, and Beersheba, where the legend of the Patriarchs was formed and told to travellers and pilgrims. The fragments were, at a later date, put together into an organic whole, the unifying factor being God's covenanted promise to the Fathers and the concentration of interest on a privileged line of elects, in contrast with drop-out individuals and clans. The internal evidence is corroborated externally by the archaeological material and by a wealth of extrabiblical and epigraphic documents, which have placed the Canaanites, among whom the Hebrews were to settle, under the lime-light. The leitmotiv of Patriarchal history, in its double aspect, episodic and tribal, represents the early phase of the Messianic faith which was to shape the civil and religious destiny of Israel, and direct the nation, willy nilly, toward the "Christ event," thus making intelligible the entire course of human history.

The Geste of the Patriarchs is followed by the record of Moses' liturgical and legislative institutions which rules the people of Israel as a political and religious body, and which survived long after the nation had lost its territorial integrity. The so-called Books of Moses constitute a remarkable paradigm of early institutional history, drafted against a background of events the substance of which cannot possibly be denied: the revelation of Yahweh at the burning bush, the epos of the liberation from Egyptian bondage, the first Pascha, the giving of the Law and the Sinaitic alliance, the conquest and settlement of the Promised Land, when the nomadic shepherds turned into peasants, when their encampments became villages and their wandering tribes territorial districts. That there enters into the presentation of the facts a part of stylistic artificiality and a considerable schematization cannot be denied, but we are not at liberty to reject the basic historicity of the record.

The so-called "Historical Books:" Samuel and Kings, Paralipomens, Ezra-Nehemiah and the Maccabees, especially the first Book, come closest to our modern conception of history. The hors d'oeuvres are kept at a minimum, and are invariably ordered in function of a point of history or of doctrine; cf. for instance the cycle of the Elijah-Elisha stories to illustrate the struggle of Yahwism against Baalism. Occasionally, the anonymous author indicates his sources. Thus the elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. 1:17, is quoted after the Book of Yashar, "the Just," a collection of popular songs, which contained along with other pieces the hymn celebrating the battle of Gibeon, Jos.

10:15; the Books of the Kings refer repeatedly to the Chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah; the Paralipomens quote *verbatim* from the canonical Books, from the Annals of the kings, and from the Acts of miscellaneous prophets and charismatics. In spite of the efforts of late redactors or compilers to harmonize their documents, conflicting trends can easily be detected, such as, in the Books of Samuel, the contest between the theocratic ideal and the institution of the monarchy, or the tribal reactions against national centralization. The Books of the Kings and the Paralipomens reflect clearly the different concern of their authors. The notices of Kings, hostile to the northern monarchs, are written with a pro-Jerusalem bias and out of concern for the Messianic destiny of the House of David. The Paralipomens, composed in the priestly circles of post-exilic Palestine strive at vindicating the antiquity of the theocratic idea, and see in the clerical predominance the only hope for the restored nation. If we are willing to make some allowance for midrashic material or secondary interpolations, we shall find these writings in substantial agreement on factual data, and the differences of perspective from one Book to the other, far from discrediting the record, are of utmost importance for a right understanding of the past. This is all pure gold for the historians, and the picture they are able to draw inserts itself more than tolerably well in what we know of the chronology and history of the nations and empires of the Near and Middle East.

We might include at this point such relations historical only in appearance, such as the Book of Judith, whose heroine is featured after the model of Yahel the Kenite, Jos. 4:17ff and 5:24. Judith, "the Jewess," is an incarnation of Jewish nationalism at its fiercest. The campaign of Holofernes cannot be accommodated in the framework of general history. The topography is a piece of high phantasy, and the toponymy, a miscellany of geographic names aiming at being impressive by their very accumulation. By an alarming coincidence, the final episode is located in the region which, precisely, had been the theatre of the fight recorded, with great sobriety, by the author of Joshuah, ch. 4. As for the key place names of Bethulia and Betomesthaim, they are otherwise utterly unknown. In all probability, we have to deal here, and in similar pieces of the Old Testament, with a midrash, what we would call a "short story." But a short story or a novel can still be regarded as a suitable mode of expression for describing the mood of a people in critical times: witness Pasternak's "Doctor

Zhivago," out of which the drama of the Russian Revolution comes to life, perhaps more vividly than through the pieces of an authentic documentation, supposing such a one to be adequate or obtainable.¹¹

I will not insist on the historicity of the Prophetical Books, having discussed the problem in a communication made at the Conference of Hermeneutical Theology held in the spring of 1972 under the auspices of the Church of Greece and the University of Athens.¹² I had chosen the Book of Isaiah, which is eminently representative of the prophetic literature of the Hebrews, with a view to ascertaining the historical information it offers, either as it reflects the events or circumstances contemporaneous of Isaiah and his continuators, or as it enables us to trace the early developments of a spiritual tradition which finds its final expression in the New Testament, and thus constitutes a suitable foundation for Biblical hermeneutics. I would simply repeat here that the Book of Isaiah, as we read it today—and we should note that the Qumran manuscripts present it already in this form, with insignificant or little significant variations—is in reality a collection of oracles and poems, animated by a same spirit, and which I beg to call "the Isaian Corpus." In this corpus, three major divisions are easily distinguishable. The first one, chapters 6-12, apart from the introductory section, some editorial verses, and a few erratic pieces, consists of prophetic utterances of Isaiah himself, reflecting the historical background of his early ministry, and announcing the birth and mission of the Immanuel. At first, the child born of a virgin is a sign given by God to restore the courage and trust of the people of Jerusalem, shaken by the imminence of an attack by the combined forces of Damascus and Samaria, then by the growing threat of the Assyrian invasion, against which any kind of resistance by military force was pronounced futile, for Yahweh alone can deliver His people, and as a matter of fact He did. But Immanuel remains unidentified.¹³ It is clear that he is thought here as the central figure of a Davidic-dynastic Messianism, and his role as Defender and Deliverer is projected forward into the future: the Divine protection of which he is the instrument par excellence shall continue to the end of time.

The second great division of the Isaian corpus, which can be called appropriately the Book of the Consolation of Israel, chapters 40-55, stages a mysterious "Servant" (see above, note 13), sent of Yahweh to announce the imminent deliverance of

Israel, at present defeated, invaded, conquered, and exiled to Babylon. The historical background is posterior by nearly one and one half century to the events forming the framework of the Immanuel prophecies, and a direct Isaian authorship is, to say the least, highly improbable.¹⁴ The mission, the Passion, and the ultimate triumph of the Servant, repeatedly quoted in the Gospel as types of Our Lord's life, death, and glorious Resurrection, caused St. Jerome to write: Isaiah, "who should be called an Evangelist, rather than a Prophet." We notice that the poems of the Servant certainly look further and toward something higher than merely the return of the exiles to the homeland.

Similarly, the oracles of the third part of the Book, chapters 56-66, addressed to the repatriated Israelites, aim at warning them against discouragement in presence of the difficult circumstances of the restoration, which was not at all the victorious return they had dreamt of, but involved a painstaking work of reconstruction amidst the hostility of the occupants. The message is one of spiritual revival, an imperious calling to realize the ideal of the chosen priesthood, of the holy nation, to the benefit of the entire human race.

On the strength of these observations, we may summarize in a few words the contribution of the Book of Isaiah to our knowledge of history. First, it presents us with a gauge of the feelings and reactions of the people of Judah, the little folk as well as their leaders, the charismatics and those in office, to the changing fortunes of the country, glorious at times, humiliating at others. To these vicissitudes, the Book is more sensitive than the matter-of-fact notices of the historical Books, with which it stands in substantial agreement as to what happened. Furthermore, it constitutes an outstanding witness for the essential nature of Davidic messianism, its origin and its development. We admit that there is an unavoidable lack of definition in its image of the latter days, yet the picture shall be brought back into focus, by the appearance of that son of David, who was born in Bethlehem of Juda in order to inaugurate the new aeon. Thus, the prediction of Isaiah and his continuators demonstrate the birth and continuous growth of a tradition not interrupted, but continued in the New Testament and in the Church, where it would blossom and ultimately bear fruit. None of these features of the Book can be regarded as peripheric or incidental; they all stand at the core of Israel's spiritual history. Similar observations could be made proportionally on the basis of the other prophetic Books.

Turning now to the third great division of the Old Testament, the "Writings" (*Ketubhim*), in contradistinction against the Law and the Prophets, we would scarcely expect to find much historical information. The Siracid's praise of the great ancestors, Eccl. chapters 44-50, is a pious rhapsody, which teaches little or nothing that is not already known through the factual accounts of the historical Books and/or extrabiblical sources; its chief value is to make us acquainted with the admiring meditation of a Jewish worthy of the first century B.C. on the past glories of his nation, and this, after all, is not negligible. The authorship ascriptions of the poetical Books which form the major part of the *Ketubhim* are, to say the least, historically problematic; we should not take them for granted, even though we might do well to ascertain, if at all possible, the reasons which prompted editors and compilers to introduce these Books under the names of David, or of Solomon.¹⁵ If the contribution of these writings to "battle history" is nil, they are nevertheless valuable, directly or indirectly, for the literary and religious history of the Hebrews from the times of the monarchy onward.

The Psalms, as the Prayer Book of the Temple and the Synagogue for public and for private worship, are a precious document of the Jews' most intimate thoughts and affects of piety, their remorse for their sins and the sins of the nation, their ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving, as they laid their hearts bare before Yahweh. The gnomic literature acquaints us with what seems to have been the human wisdom of a class of Egyptian-trained bureaucrats of the royal administration. Some of their maxims are credited to Solomon himself, as to the initiator of the genre, and they sustain comparison with the sayings of the Pharaonic scribes and of the sage Ahikar. They may appear to us somewhat prosaic and pedestrian, but Divine Wisdom disdained them not, visiting them and infusing them with a higher inspiration, and the Church borrowed abundantly from them for its liturgical readings. The maxims of the Siracid continue the tradition, with a distinctive clerical flavor.

Particularly important for the history of religious ideas is the existence of a literature of protest diversely manifested, in the Psalms, in the anxious questioning of Job, in the skeptical shrugging-the-shoulders of Qoheleth, against an easy, but false and tenacious interpretation of the ethics of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school of thought. It had become increasingly clear to all, great and small, that moral retributions in this world

are not automatic, since pious, righteous men, more than once, are overcome by suffering, while the rascal next door is insolently prosperous.

Finally, the shift to a Logos theology formulated in Greek terms and akin to Philonic categories, is most perceptible in the Book of Wisdom, which, in spite of its apocryphal ascription to Solomon, constitutes an outstanding document witnessing to the opening of a narrowly confined Judaism toward universality. All this is of primary importance to the historian, as well as to the theologian.

In all that precedes, I have merely suggested the desirability of a fuller use of the historical method broadly understood, for a critical study and interpretation of the Scriptures. I feel very strongly that historical exegesis ought to be delivered from the straight jacket in which it has been laced by reason of monistic assumptions and of an exclusive dependence on a mechanistic system of causality. Even from a pure philosophical standpoint, teleology ought to be re-visited and rehabilitated, but it is not likely that this will happen soon, due to prevailing ideologies and to the fact that history as a science has unwarrantedly been conceived on the same pattern as mathematics or physical sciences. Many more examples might be brought forth in support of my contention. This may be only one aspect of our task, but my personal conviction is that, in the perspective which I have tried to open, the Bible is truly and properly history, sacred history.

SAINT VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY TUCKAHOE, NEW YORK

NOTES

* A paper delivered at the spring meeting of the "Orthodox Theological Society in America" at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Mass.

1. We quote from the second edition, London and New York, 1912.
2. Langlois-Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, p. 98 f.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 100, 195.
4. G. J. Renier, *History, its Purpose and Method*, p. 49.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 225 ff.

6. Morton White, **Foundation of Historical Knowledge**, p 213, upbraids "some self-appointed spokesmen for scientific history," namely Toynbee and "certain Marxists," who, ironically enough, appeal to obscure or mysterious causes, personal or impersonal, in order to explain occurrences seemingly irreducible to rational patterns
- 7 *Ibid* , p 208 f
- 8 The book, published in 1903, was re-edited in 1966, with an up-dating preface by the late Père de Vaux
9. In Mesopotamia, Oannes (=Ea) and the fish-gods of the Persian Gulf who imported arts and sciences into Chaldaea, in Egypt, Thot and his associates The early Christian apologists attributed to the personal action of the Logos the universal progress of humanity
10. We take "legend" in the original meaning of "record of heroic deeds, to be read or recited publicly "
11. I am aware that my comparison limps After all, Pasternak had been ocular witness to real events, whereas the author of Judith could not possibly claim to have witnessed events which he imagines!
- 12 My paper will appear in the acts of the Conference, to be issued incessantly It was published with the kind permission of the organizing committee, in **St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly**, XVI (1972), pp 107-127, under the title "Critical exegesis and traditional hermeneutics a methodological inquiry on the basis of the Book of Isaiah " For a brief account of the Conference and the official statement drafted in conclusion of the proceedings, *ibid* , pp 153-157, and **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, XVII (1972), p 305 f
- 13 Exegetes of all times and of diverse background have tried to identify the Immanuel, and similarly the Servant of Yahweh in the second part of the Book of Isaiah They worked on the principle that Immanuel and the Servant have to be identified with individuals (or collectivities) close to the times of the events which appear to form the framework of the prophecies Some of these attempts are plausible, none, however, are conclusive
14. Notwithstanding a decree of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of the Roman See (1908), which forbids Catholic scholars to teach that the second (and third) part of the Book of Isaiah may not have Isaiah himself as author The decree has been allowed to lapse into a comfortable obscurity, but it has condemned a full generation of Catholic exegetes to stagnation, foxy cautiousness, or downright hypocrisy
15. It should be noted at this point that those ascriptions of authorship do not necessarily apply to the entirety, but to the major part of the Books which they introduce thus David's Psalter contains groups of Psalms explicitly attributed to various authors, presumably influential "choir-directors" of the Temple, the Book of Proverbs contains, in addition to the maxims circulated under the name of Solomon, sections attributed to Lemuel, Agur, and other sages

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

THE NOTION OF HISTORICITY AND THE CRITICAL STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT *

By GEORGES BARROIS

The historicity of the Bible, a locution deceptively simple in appearance, involves in reality many complex judgments of fact and of value. Used without sufficient discretion, as it happened in many popular handbooks, it leads often to massive affirmations or negations generating more heat than light. My purpose here is to bring it into better focus, by figuring out what historicity means, and by applying the fruit of my reflection to Old Testament studies.

A definition by *genus* and *species* might pre-empt our conclusions. It will be probably better to start from an empirical description of historicity, based on concrete elements of the historical process. I would propose this, subject to further clarification: historicity is that particular quality of documents relative to past events and physical or psychological facts, inasmuch as the memory of such, at first unrecorded, subsequently consigned in writing and eventually gathered in compilations of diverse age, worth and purpose, forms the subject-matter of history.

A capital remark has to be made at this point: facts themselves cannot be described as historical or un-historical. This is a shortened way of speaking. What is properly and primarily historical is the record of such facts in written documents or epigraphic documents. By extension, uninscribed monuments and objects may be considered as accessory to the historical process. On the basis of the material thus gathered and tested, the historian tries to infer what has happened in the past, how, when, why, and whether it seems to have conditioned or determined the so-called "course of history."

We should not overlook, however, that the historian's knowledge of the past is not, and cannot be, coextensive with what actually happened, nor how it did happen. The historical past is

only a part of the total past. Things did happen that are not traceable, either of themselves or, temporarily, for actual lack of clues. The fact and the how of such occurrences may eventually be assumed with greater or lesser probability, at least on an hypothetical basis, but they are not receivable as material evidence in the court of history. I am thinking, by way of illustration, of tombstones in Brittany: "N . . . , Perdu en mer (lost at sea)." The only thing certain is that N . . . sailed out of Paimpol, or Cancale, and did not return. His death is bound to remain hypothetical, until the sea gives back the body of N . . . , and they lay him to rest in the little churchyard. Another example might be taken from the missing link in the evolution of a species, or from a developmental phase, still to be discovered, in a biological chain.

Our first problem, therefore, is one of method: how can we best deal with the documentation at our disposal, that we may reach valid conclusions? What help may we receive from kindred disciplines, such as anthropology, archaeology, sociology and economic or political sciences, which can throw an indirect, but always welcome light, on the path of the historian? And what are the natural limitations of the historical enterprise? We must not demand of history what it cannot possibly give, because of the very nature of the historical process, or of the particular difficulty of a given problem. It should be obvious that history will never yield an iron clad demonstration of Christian faith or a justification of the dogma.

It is generally understood that two preliminary procedures are indispensable for writing history: first, a critical examination of the documents from a formal point of view: textual criticism, age and origin of the sources, identification of authors, editors and compilers, stylistic patterns, and the like. The second procedure, hermeneutics proper, viz. the interpretation of the documents, aims at evaluating contents in relation to the historical context, at determining what the source documents meant for their contemporaries and how they were understood by later generations, at observing the evolution, the deviations, and eventually the vanishing of traditions. Critical analysis and interpretation of the documents should never be separated nor isolated from each other; rather they interlock, even though theoreticians of historical methodology may differ in appraising their mutual relationship.

I may be permitted to trace the development of historical methods by excerpting from three modern treatises, admittedly picked at random from a library shelf. The first one is the well-

known *Introduction to the Study of History*, written in close collaboration by two prominent French scholars, Ch. V. Langlois and Ch. Seignobos, translated into English by G. G. Berry in 1898, and re-edited many times.¹ The book, intended as a Manual for the students of the Sorbonne and of the Ecole Normale, has become a classic and, so to speak, the Bible of historical methodology for generations of scholars. It is still quoted as an epoch-making contribution to historical science. The general emphasis is on what has been sneeringly described as "battle history," which refers to such obvious facts as dynastic changes, revolutions, wars, peace treatises and covenants, most of the time abundantly documented by official instruments, chancery records, or private relations and Memoires. We may note that, about that time, the German historians were trying to extend their research to the broader field, but less sharply defined, of the history of culture (*Kulturgeschichte*), and its varieties. The Manual insists on the necessity of submitting the historical documentation to negative criticism, in order to test its receivability, for a reasonable amount of critical doubt is essential to the method.

"An historian fails in criticism when he neglects to distinguish between documents, when he never mistrusts traditional ascriptions, and when he accepts, as if afraid to lose a single one, all the pieces of information, ancient or modern, good or bad, which come to him, from whatever quarter We must not, however, be satisfied with this form of criticism, and we must not abuse of it The extreme of distrust, in these matters, is almost as mischievous as the extreme of credulity."²

Indispensable as it is, negative criticism is only preparatory, limited in scope, and cannot be expected to yield any positive information amounting to certitude, but only to a greater or lesser probability. The final aim of criticism is

" . . . to get rid of documents which are not documents, and which would have misled us; that is all Criticism merely destroys illusory sources of information; it supplies nothing certain to take their place. The only sure results of criticism are negative. All the positive results are subject to doubt; they reduce to propositions of the form: there are chances for or against the truth of such and such a statement. Chances only."³

Having thus cleared the way by means of negative criticism, the

historian now proceeds guardedly to a search of the past for causes or explanations, and should be ready to build up. The rigorism of historical criticism à la Langlois-Seignobos guarantees unimpeachable conclusions, yet we cannot help feeling that they suffer from an unjustified minimalism. Their method makes little or no allowance for imponderable quantities stubbornly resisting any kind of regimentation and not receivable as historical evidence strictly speaking, yet offering precious information to the historian. Our authors work principally on the basis of records relative to physical, external facts and events easily pinned down, but history has to deal also with psychological facts and developments more difficult to identify, record, or interpret. Furthermore, valuable sources are left untapped, because they are deemed marginal or extraneous to history in a narrow sense. And here is precisely where the "Langlois-Seignobos" shows its age: the study of social, religious, economic phenomena, of folklore, myths and legends, the scientific measuring of public opinion, still in infancy or yet to be born, did not or could not figure on official academic programs. They would have met, anyway, with more than suspicion on the part of our two scholars, just as whatever seemed to involve an appeal to transcendental causes, Providence or its equivalent, was curtly dismissed by them as "metaphysics," a category unwelcome to Auguste Comte and the positivists, whose ideology reigned over the Sorbonne. Incidentally, it is as good as dead in contemporary Europe, but many an American campus is still affected by some sort of hangover.

A second book, *History, its Purpose and Method*, by G. J. Renier, a Dutchman (the name suggests a French Huguenot descent), Professor in the University of London, was first published in 1950. Renier stands resolutely by the principles of Langlois-Seignobos, whom he quotes approvingly, sharing their views on the necessity of keeping historical methods "clean," and excluding deliberately from the historical agenda sociology and philosophy of history. In his eyes, such an exclusion

"... is more than a matter of methodological convenience. To grant these subjects rights of citizenship within our discipline would alter its texture and its function. Sociology . . . is a humanistic science, a systematization of observations made by men about men. All such disciplines remain subjective in their generalizations; their syntheses are influenced by the temperament, the antecedents, the outlook of those who practice them."⁴

Yet, by a happy in consequence, Renier takes sharp exception with the theory according to which the historian ought to remain totally unbiased and express no personal views; such detachment, in his opinion, is neither possible nor desirable, as it would mean a deliberate self-mutilation. With this we concur most heartily, as when, at a few pages of distance, we catch him in the very act of "philosophizing," an activity, eminently "subjective," which he deprecates, but which, in the present case, yields unexpected dividends.

"If we believe that there are in the human past perceptible regularities of occurrence which the historian can formulate and use as tools for telling his story, we believe, by implication, that the historian's world, the human past, can be understood by him, that it is intelligible, and that, figuratively speaking, it is reasonable Once we believe in this intelligibility, we are entitled to assume that the human past cannot be mere chaos."⁵

Now this comes singularly close to something that resembles neither a blind fate, nor a succession of fortuitous occurrences, but rather presupposes an orientation, an ordering of facts and events, no matter what the principle, or principles, of such an order may be. Being carried to the limit, would this not spell "Providence"?

The third book from which I would quote is Morton White's *Foundation of Historical Knowledge*, published in 1965. The author, a Professor of philosophy at Harvard, is concerned with the epistemology of the notion of causality, as applied to historical phenomenology, and investigated according to the method of analytical philosophy. From this standpoint, it is obvious that considerations as to the ultimate *telos*, or a search for the First Cause, must remain out of bounds for history as such, that is, beyond the range of historical inquiry.⁶ Most valuable in Morton White's book is the analytical testing of causal and non-causal explanations, rational or non-rational, essential causes and causes contributory. From this examination, the author concludes to the un-typical use of the notion of causality by historians, which makes it futile to place the historical process on par with the so-called "exact" sciences. Similarly, any monistic justification for historical occurrences, as would be an all-out mechanistic hypothesis, an all-out economic, or political, or ecological explanation, is rejected.

"To adopt a monistic theory of the explanation . . . in any branch of history, is as indefensible as to adopt one in the law. It is much like saying that automobile accidents are always to be explained by reference to the icy condition of the road . . . or to the drunkenness of the driver . . . or to faulty brakes. An advocate of Marxism or psychoanalysis may of course collect statistics comparable to those collected by insurance companies . . . But such statistics would not eliminate the need for studying each case individually."⁷

This eliminates radically a univocal conception of history, and opens broader prospects than the overly restricted methodology of positivism, without threatening the validity of conclusions drawn from well-balanced criticism and hermeneutics. The adjective "historical" is polyvalent: there are historical facts and events, historical traditions, historical trends of thought, historical methods of interpreting or representing the facts or events of the past. The notion of historicity applies proportionally to the various quantities we call historical, and which, in one way or another, are legitimate objects of history.

I pass now to the second part of this article, and I shall try to show how our conception of the historical method affects the study of the Old Testament. As could be expected, the development of Biblical scholarship during the past seventy-five years parallels the evolution of historical methodology. The critical method advocated by the early theoreticians of history, moved as they were by positivistic and kindred ideologies, inspired the concern of western theologians for "re-visiting" the Bible, and especially the Old Testament. They reacted against the stagnation of Biblical scholarship among Christians and Jews alike. Protestant radicals, eager to free themselves from the fetters of tradition, rejected or by-passed the claims of the Bible to be an inspired writing and the authentic record of Divine Revelation. The Old Testament had to be put in its place as just a piece of eastern literature, and Biblical religion as just one more Semitic religion. These were the days of Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel*, and of the critical *post-mortem* of the Pentateuch, the dissection of which was recorded graphically in the color-printed sheets of Haupt's "Rainbow Bible." Roman Catholic scholars countered by trying to use the critical method constructively, in order to buttress, rather than to batter, the traditional positions, and to open new avenues for a better understanding of the Scriptures committed to the Church. A certain apologetic overtone is easily detected in

Fr. Lagrange's *La méthode historique*, which met, alas, with suspicion and even undisguised hostility on the part of ultra-conservative elements in the Roman curia, and in the Roman Catholic Church at large.⁸

These battles had been fought on the terrain of Biblical criticism as such. Meanwhile, the need for a renovated hermeneutics was felt by all. The search goes on. Orthodox theologians have taken the initiative to investigate systematically the principles of interpretation which the Bible itself suggests and which guided the Church Fathers. A number of Roman Catholic scholars are working independently toward similar objectives, witness the publication of such series as the scholarly *Sources Chrétiennes*, or the more popular American collections.

A wise application of the historical method to the study of Scripture and Patristics should contribute greatly toward laying a solid foundation for hermeneutics, and ultimately toward deciding what, from a Christian standpoint, must be regarded as relevant or normative, a decision of which history is indeed an essential factor, but which, short of Christian faith, lies beyond the grasp of human endeavour. In fact, however, hermeneutics, in the hands of a majority of independent and Protestant scholars, is in a bewildering disarray. The reason for this seems to be their conscious disregard or total rejection of tradition as a guiding principle, and their attempt at building up a science of hermeneutics on a variety of philosophical (at times, alas, sophomoric!) ideologies and methods, such as Hegelianism and its derivatives, modernistic symbolism, demythologizing, desacralizing, an intemperate use of linguistic analysis raised to the level of a panacea, or the application of a wild, nihilistic variety of the theory of literary forms (*Formgeschichte*).

After this overlong excursus on the status of Old Testament scholarship, I shall limit myself to considering the following problem: granted that the notion of historicity, as we have tried to describe it, is not to be understood as univocal, but as polyvalent, and seeing that the Bible, as we read it today, is a collection of various pieces of inspired Scriptures, then how or on which grounds can the traditional sections of the Old Testament, *Torah*, *Nebhiim*, and *Ketubhim*, be called "historical"? More precisely, which items in the sacred page, either directly or indirectly expressed, qualify as historical records of the Divine Revelation, and from which standpoints can they be ascribed the note of historicity? In the last sentence, the adjective historical must be

underscored. The task that lies before us is emphatically not that we should distinguish in the Holy Scriptures elements inspired, and consequently authoritative, from statements non inspired: the charism of inspiration makes it that everything in Scripture is, in some way or other, instrumental to the total Revelation of the Christian mystery, but not everything is susceptible to be scrutinized through the historical inquiry, which remains essentially limited in scope and method.

Opening the Book of Genesis, I would distinguish the following categories: Creation narratives, history of the origins (*Urgeschichte*), and Patriarchal history. It is obvious that the Creation narratives, viz. the Hexaemeron, the creation of man in Eden, the Creator's rest on the seventh day, the fall and expulsion from Paradise, cannot possibly be regarded as historical by modern standards, which does not mean that they have no real substance. To begin with, no witness can be called, no document produced; but here is not the problem. Literary criticism has established the affinity of these narratives with early cosmogonies and mythological poems of the Near and Middle East, and it appears that the author, or authors, of the Book of Genesis, made use of this common-domain material, demythologized it, and made it into a vehicle for expressing what they believed to be God's revelation to mankind, namely that He is the God who called all things into existence and due order through His Word; that He breathed from His Spirit into every living thing; that He created the first human couple in His likeness; that He called all men to partake of His own blessedness; that He tested the free obedience of man and it was found wanting, and that He did override evil by the promise of a Savior from the seed of Adam—the Protevangel in the initial pages of the Bible, Now these are the headlines of the original Paradosis, substantiated, clarified, and implemented in all the subsequent Biblical records. Precisely in these lies the traditional material out of which we can write the religious history of the Hebrew people, rather than build up easy, and deceiving, syncretisms on the basis of common literary formulae.

The same can be assumed of the history of origins (*Urgeschichte*), which tells the story of all the "first's": the first murder, the first musicians, the first iron smith, the first act of retributive justice (by way of vengeance!), all these as imagined in popular speculations on the progress or failures of the human race. We may note here a partial demythologization of the corresponding Oriental folklore, according to which the arts and skills of

men were ascribed a divine origin.⁹ Now we should beware lest we confuse the history of origins with human paleontology or pre-historic anthropology. This would amount to concordism, and concordism, either naive or sophisticated, leads generally nowhere, and often betrays the very purpose of Scripture, which is to instruct us in righteousness (2 Tim. 3:16), and not into erudition. Of course, every partial truth, no matter how it is won, will, in last analysis, resolve into the ultimate Truth. Biblical truth, Biblical history, must not be kept incommunicado from scientific truth firmly established by proper methods, but we are wary of short-circuiting the process of integration of truth by premature connections. We wonder whether Teilhard de Chardin's romantic vision of a universe oriented toward his famous Omega point, where the "Cosmic Christ" shall be all in all, should not represent an ingenious variety of sophisticated concordism. At any rate, it has done much to provoke malevolent accusations of confusion of perspectives, universalism, pantheistic monism, and to embarrass Teilhard's friends and fellow Jesuits.

The historicity of the Patriarchal narratives is of a different order. The legend of the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and his sons, eponyms of the tribes of Israel,¹⁰ belongs in a literary category with which modern Orientalists have long been familiar, but which seems to have been neglected or ignored as estraneous to "scientific" history. It consists of biographical fragments giving a vivid picture of the personality of tribal chieftains, whose down-to-earth individual features and reactions to environment and circumstances appear in bold relief. At the same time, in pure Bedouin fashion, their genealogies reflect a social setup in which blood-ties are of primary importance; these genealogies double as a framework for the history of the tribes. The general trustworthiness of the traditions is well established, internally, by the consistency and essential agreement of episodes recorded sometimes in duplicate or triplicate from different perspectives. Modern critics are used to base their distinction of early documents or sources of the Book of Genesis, such as J, the Yahwistic source, and E, the Elohist, originating, the former in Judah, the latter in the northern districts of Palestine, on the characteristic differences exhibited by these narratives, their particular emphasis, their vocabulary, local color, and intended objectives. Such distinctions within the Book could be explained equally well, and perhaps even better, in reference to the various sanctuaries of the Patriarchal

period, Shechem, Bethel, Mamrê-Hebron, and Beersheba, where the legend of the Patriarchs was formed and told to travellers and pilgrims. The fragments were, at a later date, put together into an organic whole, the unifying factor being God's covenanted promise to the Fathers and the concentration of interest on a privileged line of elects, in contrast with drop-out individuals and clans. The internal evidence is corroborated externally by the archaeological material and by a wealth of extrabiblical and epigraphic documents, which have placed the Canaanites, among whom the Hebrews were to settle, under the lime-light. The leitmotiv of Patriarchal history, in its double aspect, episodic and tribal, represents the early phase of the Messianic faith which was to shape the civil and religious destiny of Israel, and direct the nation, willy nilly, toward the "Christ event," thus making intelligible the entire course of human history.

The Geste of the Patriarchs is followed by the record of Moses' liturgical and legislative institutions which rules the people of Israel as a political and religious body, and which survived long after the nation had lost its territorial integrity. The so-called Books of Moses constitute a remarkable paradigm of early institutional history, drafted against a background of events the substance of which cannot possibly be denied: the revelation of Yahweh at the burning bush, the epos of the liberation from Egyptian bondage, the first Pascha, the giving of the Law and the Sinaitic alliance, the conquest and settlement of the Promised Land, when the nomadic shepherds turned into peasants, when their encampments became villages and their wandering tribes territorial districts. That there enters into the presentation of the facts a part of stylistic artificiality and a considerable schematization cannot be denied, but we are not at liberty to reject the basic historicity of the record.

The so-called "Historical Books:" Samuel and Kings, Paralipomens, Ezra-Nehemiah and the Maccabees, especially the first Book, come closest to our modern conception of history. The hors d'oeuvres are kept at a minimum, and are invariably ordered in function of a point of history or of doctrine; cf. for instance the cycle of the Elijah-Elisha stories to illustrate the struggle of Yahwism against Baalism. Occasionally, the anonymous author indicates his sources. Thus the elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. 1:17, is quoted after the Book of Yashar, "the Just," a collection of popular songs, which contained along with other pieces the hymn celebrating the battle of Gibeon, Jos.

10:15; the Books of the Kings refer repeatedly to the Chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah; the Paralipomens quote *verbatim* from the canonical Books, from the Annals of the kings, and from the Acts of miscellaneous prophets and charismatics. In spite of the efforts of late redactors or compilers to harmonize their documents, conflicting trends can easily be detected, such as, in the Books of Samuel, the contest between the theocratic ideal and the institution of the monarchy, or the tribal reactions against national centralization. The Books of the Kings and the Paralipomens reflect clearly the different concern of their authors. The notices of Kings, hostile to the northern monarchs, are written with a pro-Jerusalem bias and out of concern for the Messianic destiny of the House of David. The Paralipomens, composed in the priestly circles of post-exilic Palestine strive at vindicating the antiquity of the theocratic idea, and see in the clerical predominance the only hope for the restored nation. If we are willing to make some allowance for midrashic material or secondary interpolations, we shall find these writings in substantial agreement on factual data, and the differences of perspective from one Book to the other, far from discrediting the record, are of utmost importance for a right understanding of the past. This is all pure gold for the historians, and the picture they are able to draw inserts itself more than tolerably well in what we know of the chronology and history of the nations and empires of the Near and Middle East.

We might include at this point such relations historical only in appearance, such as the Book of Judith, whose heroine is featured after the model of Yahel the Kenite, Jos. 4:17ff and 5:24. Judith, "the Jewess," is an incarnation of Jewish nationalism at its fiercest. The campaign of Holofernes cannot be accommodated in the framework of general history. The topography is a piece of high phantasy, and the toponymy, a miscellany of geographic names aiming at being impressive by their very accumulation. By an alarming coincidence, the final episode is located in the region which, precisely, had been the theatre of the fight recorded, with great sobriety, by the author of Joshuah, ch. 4. As for the key place names of Bethulia and Betomesthaim, they are otherwise utterly unknown. In all probability, we have to deal here, and in similar pieces of the Old Testament, with a midrash, what we would call a "short story." But a short story or a novel can still be regarded as a suitable mode of expression for describing the mood of a people in critical times: witness Pasternak's "Doctor

Zhivago," out of which the drama of the Russian Revolution comes to life, perhaps more vividly than through the pieces of an authentic documentation, supposing such a one to be adequate or obtainable.¹¹

I will not insist on the historicity of the Prophetic Books, having discussed the problem in a communication made at the Conference of Hermeneutical Theology held in the spring of 1972 under the auspices of the Church of Greece and the University of Athens.¹² I had chosen the Book of Isaiah, which is eminently representative of the prophetic literature of the Hebrews, with a view to ascertaining the historical information it offers, either as it reflects the events or circumstances contemporaneous of Isaiah and his continuators, or as it enables us to trace the early developments of a spiritual tradition which finds its final expression in the New Testament, and thus constitutes a suitable foundation for Biblical hermeneutics. I would simply repeat here that the Book of Isaiah, as we read it today—and we should note that the Qumran manuscripts present it already in this form, with insignificant or little significant variations—is in reality a collection of oracles and poems, animated by a same spirit, and which I beg to call "the Isaian Corpus." In this corpus, three major divisions are easily distinguishable. The first one, chapters 6-12, apart from the introductory section, some editorial verses, and a few erratic pieces, consists of prophetic utterances of Isaiah himself, reflecting the historical background of his early ministry, and announcing the birth and mission of the Immanuel. At first, the child born of a virgin is a sign given by God to restore the courage and trust of the people of Jerusalem, shaken by the imminence of an attack by the combined forces of Damascus and Samaria, then by the growing threat of the Assyrian invasion, against which any kind of resistance by military force was pronounced futile, for Yahweh alone can deliver His people, and as a matter of fact He did. But Immanuel remains unidentified.¹³ It is clear that he is thought here as the central figure of a Davidic-dynastic Messianism, and his role as Defender and Deliverer is projected forward into the future: the Divine protection of which he is the instrument par excellence shall continue to the end of time.

The second great division of the Isaian corpus, which can be called appropriately the Book of the Consolation of Israel, chapters 40-55, stages a mysterious "Servant" (see above, note 13), sent of Yahweh to announce the imminent deliverance of

Israel, at present defeated, invaded, conquered, and exiled to Babylon. The historical background is posterior by nearly one and one half century to the events forming the framework of the Immanuel prophecies, and a direct Isaian authorship is, to say the least, highly improbable.¹⁴ The mission, the Passion, and the ultimate triumph of the Servant, repeatedly quoted in the Gospel as types of Our Lord's life, death, and glorious Resurrection, caused St. Jerome to write: Isaiah, "who should be called an Evangelist, rather than a Prophet." We notice that the poems of the Servant certainly look further and toward something higher than merely the return of the exiles to the homeland.

Similarly, the oracles of the third part of the Book, chapters 56-66, addressed to the repatriated Israelites, aim at warning them against discouragement in presence of the difficult circumstances of the restoration, which was not at all the victorious return they had dreamt of, but involved a painstaking work of reconstruction amidst the hostility of the occupants. The message is one of spiritual revival, an imperious calling to realize the ideal of the chosen priesthood, of the holy nation, to the benefit of the entire human race.

On the strength of these observations, we may summarize in a few words the contribution of the Book of Isaiah to our knowledge of history. First, it presents us with a gauge of the feelings and reactions of the people of Judah, the little folk as well as their leaders, the charismatics and those in office, to the changing fortunes of the country, glorious at times, humiliating at others. To these vicissitudes, the Book is more sensitive than the matter-of-fact notices of the historical Books, with which it stands in substantial agreement as to what happened. Furthermore, it constitutes an outstanding witness for the essential nature of Davidic messianism, its origin and its development. We admit that there is an unavoidable lack of definition in its image of the latter days, yet the picture shall be brought back into focus, by the appearance of that son of David, who was born in Bethlehem of Juda in order to inaugurate the new aeon. Thus, the prediction of Isaiah and his continuators demonstrate the birth and continuous growth of a tradition not interrupted, but continued in the New Testament and in the Church, where it would blossom and ultimately bear fruit. None of these features of the Book can be regarded as peripheric or incidental; they all stand at the core of Israel's spiritual history. Similar observations could be made proportionally on the basis of the other prophetic Books.

Turning now to the third great division of the Old Testament, the "Writings" (*Ketubhim*), in contradistinction against the Law and the Prophets, we would scarcely expect to find much historical information. The Siracid's praise of the great ancestors, Eccl. chapters 44-50, is a pious rhapsody, which teaches little or nothing that is not already known through the factual accounts of the historical Books and/or extrabiblical sources; its chief value is to make us acquainted with the admiring meditation of a Jewish worthy of the first century B.C. on the past glories of his nation, and this, after all, is not negligible. The authorship ascriptions of the poetical Books which form the major part of the *Ketubhim* are, to say the least, historically problematic; we should not take them for granted, even though we might do well to ascertain, if at all possible, the reasons which prompted editors and compilers to introduce these Books under the names of David, or of Solomon.¹⁵ If the contribution of these writings to "battle history" is nil, they are nevertheless valuable, directly or indirectly, for the literary and religious history of the Hebrews from the times of the monarchy onward.

The Psalms, as the Prayer Book of the Temple and the Synagogue for public and for private worship, are a precious document of the Jews' most intimate thoughts and affects of piety, their remorse for their sins and the sins of the nation, their ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving, as they laid their hearts bare before Yahweh. The gnomic literature acquaints us with what seems to have been the human wisdom of a class of Egyptian-trained bureaucrats of the royal administration. Some of their maxims are credited to Solomon himself, as to the initiator of the genre, and they sustain comparison with the sayings of the Pharaonic scribes and of the sage Ahikar. They may appear to us somewhat prosaic and pedestrian, but Divine Wisdom disdained them not, visiting them and infusing them with a higher inspiration, and the Church borrowed abundantly from them for its liturgical readings. The maxims of the Siracid continue the tradition, with a distinctive clerical flavor.

Particularly important for the history of religious ideas is the existence of a literature of protest diversely manifested, in the Psalms, in the anxious questioning of Job, in the skeptical shrugging-the-shoulders of Qoheleth, against an easy, but false and tenacious interpretation of the ethics of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic school of thought. It had become increasingly clear to all, great and small, that moral retributions in this world

are not automatic, since pious, righteous men, more than once, are overcome by suffering, while the rascal next door is insolently prosperous.

Finally, the shift to a Logos theology formulated in Greek terms and akin to Philonic categories, is most perceptible in the Book of Wisdom, which, in spite of its apocryphal ascription to Solomon, constitutes an outstanding document witnessing to the opening of a narrowly confined Judaism toward universality. All this is of primary importance to the historian, as well as to the theologian.

In all that precedes, I have merely suggested the desirability of a fuller use of the historical method broadly understood, for a critical study and interpretation of the Scriptures. I feel very strongly that historical exegesis ought to be delivered from the straight jacket in which it has been laced by reason of monistic assumptions and of an exclusive dependence on a mechanistic system of causality. Even from a pure philosophical standpoint, teleology ought to be re-visited and rehabilitated, but it is not likely that this will happen soon, due to prevailing ideologies and to the fact that history as a science has unwarrantedly been conceived on the same pattern as mathematics or physical sciences. Many more examples might be brought forth in support of my contention. This may be only one aspect of our task, but my personal conviction is that, in the perspective which I have tried to open, the Bible is truly and properly history, sacred history.

SAINT VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY TUCKAHOE, NEW YORK

NOTES

* A paper delivered at the spring meeting of the "Orthodox Theological Society in America" at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Mass.

1. We quote from the second edition, London and New York, 1912.
2. Langlois-Seignobos, *Introduction to the Study of History*, p. 98 f.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 100, 195.
4. G. J. Renier, *History, its Purpose and Method*, p. 49.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 225 ff.

6. Morton White, **Foundation of Historical Knowledge**, p 213, upbraids "some self-appointed spokesmen for scientific history," namely Toynbee and "certain Marxists," who, ironically enough, appeal to obscure or mysterious causes, personal or impersonal, in order to explain occurrences seemingly irreducible to rational patterns
- 7 *Ibid* , p 208 f
- 8 The book, published in 1903, was re-edited in 1966, with an up-dating preface by the late Père de Vaux
9. In Mesopotamia, Oannes (=Ea) and the fish-gods of the Persian Gulf who imported arts and sciences into Chaldaea, in Egypt, Thot and his associates The early Christian apologists attributed to the personal action of the Logos the universal progress of humanity
10. We take "legend" in the original meaning of "record of heroic deeds, to be read or recited publicly "
11. I am aware that my comparison limps After all, Pasternak had been ocular witness to real events, whereas the author of Judith could not possibly claim to have witnessed events which he imagines!
- 12 My paper will appear in the acts of the Conference, to be issued incessantly It was published with the kind permission of the organizing committee, in **St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly**, XVI (1972), pp 107-127, under the title "Critical exegesis and traditional hermeneutics a methodological inquiry on the basis of the Book of Isaiah " For a brief account of the Conference and the official statement drafted in conclusion of the proceedings, *ibid* , pp 153-157, and **The Greek Orthodox Theological Review**, XVII (1972), p 305 f
- 13 Exegetes of all times and of diverse background have tried to identify the Immanuel, and similarly the Servant of Yahweh in the second part of the Book of Isaiah They worked on the principle that Immanuel and the Servant have to be identified with individuals (or collectivities) close to the times of the events which appear to form the framework of the prophecies Some of these attempts are plausible, none, however, are conclusive
14. Notwithstanding a decree of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of the Roman See (1908), which forbids Catholic scholars to teach that the second (and third) part of the Book of Isaiah may not have Isaiah himself as author The decree has been allowed to lapse into a comfortable obscurity, but it has condemned a full generation of Catholic exegetes to stagnation, foxy cautiousness, or downright hypocrisy
15. It should be noted at this point that those ascriptions of authorship do not necessarily apply to the entirety, but to the major part of the Books which they introduce thus David's Psalter contains groups of Psalms explicitly attributed to various authors, presumably influential "choir-directors" of the Temple, the Book of Proverbs contains, in addition to the maxims circulated under the name of Solomon, sections attributed to Lemuel, Agur, and other sages

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

PATRIARCH PHOTIOS' LETTER TO THE BISHOPS IN EXILE

By DESPINA STRATOUDAKI WHITE

In the winter of 870 Patriarch Photios of Constantinople was condemned for the fifth time and sent into exile to the monastery of Skepi by imperial order.¹ There he was placed under heavy guard and every comfort was denied to him. Along with the Patriarch all the bishops who were consecrated by him were exiled also and were stripped of their positions.² Upon repentance they could be admitted only as laymen to communion. The churches consecrated by the Patriarch were torn down. Whatever he had done as a cleric was nullified and destroyed.

It was a difficult time for Photios. Exiled, guarded by soldiers, stripped from all honors and comforts of life, he used every rare opportunity to write to his friends in order to sustain them, and in doing so he was also strengthening his own spirit.

During these long and hard years of exile and confinement the present letter to the bishops, also in exile, was written. It is an apology for the reproaches of someone whom the Patriarch does not name, because, as he says, it is easier for him to receive advice this way. The letter opens as a cry against "this friend" who probably was one of the few bishops who deserted Photios. His accuser, the Patriarch sadly says, is a man with a short memory: "but how has he so quickly abandoned his knowledge of us as to accuse us of such folly and contempt for the divine laws?" He refers sadly to his sufferings; the hardest to bare is the separation from his fellow bishops: "taking us away from our friends, separating us from our relatives, cutting us off from each other from you (which) for me is the worst of my sufferings." He wished that he were at least allowed to have some of his books to read: "First they have closed our eyes, for what other explanation, when one is not allowed to set eyes on other men, nor is able to have books, especially if one has reading as his first and greatest consolation?" The Patriarch's deep affection for the members of the clergy, particularly his fellow bishops in exile is clearly evident.

A paternal devotion is present throughout the letter to his associates in the episcopacy. From various testimonies it is also evident that the bishops remained faithful to the deposed Patriarch in spite of their sufferings.³ His many references to St. Paul verify his love and preference for this disciple. His self-discipline is clear throughout this long epistle. Steeped in Christian tradition and theology, he suffers and forgives, advising the bishops to act accordingly.⁴ Photios never gives up hope that their enemy finally will realize his mistake, ". . . because I have very high hopes," he writes to his bishops, "that your wise and good advice and thoughts will quickly cure the man."

In a dramatic conclusion, like a great *doxologia*, the Photian doctrine of the relationship of Church and State is stated clearly: the heads of State and Church are the Emperor and the Patriarch respectively. Those two leaders of the Universe have a task to work together in close and peaceful harmony for the good of mankind. The Patriarch's duty is to care after the souls of his flock, while the Emperor looks after their body. The Bishops, according to Photios, belong to the royal order of the priesthood: "But you have been annointed by the Holy one . . . and the annointing which you have received from him abides in you . . ."⁵ The Bishops, being the chosen people, will have a special place in the Heavenly kingdom: "There, in Heaven, is the church of the first born where there are the bands of the martyrs and the tents of the patriarchs . . ."⁶ While on earth, however, Photios reminds his Bishops through the words of St. Peter: "Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme . . ."⁷ and again "Honor the Emperor."⁸ In the conclusion of this epistle, Photios simply and clearly defines the relationship of the Byzantine Church towards the Emperor in a few words. The Priesthood in Byzantium is supposed to follow Christ's example and leave Caesar's things to Caesar, because their realm is not of this world. This doctrine is explicitly stated in the *Epanagoge* commissioned by Basil I, and whose author is suspected to be Patriarch Photios.⁹

The theory of the dual control is not new in Byzantium. Earlier in the sixth century, Emperor Justinian in the *Sixth Novel*, had stated explicitly the distinction between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium*, as two completely separated authorities coming from God to mankind. The great Photios is simply reminding his Bishops of this fact.

TO THE BISHOPS IN EXILE¹

I marvel how he,² whoever he may be, has so quickly forgotten our nature. For I would not wish to charge him by name, lest he might become more insolent. For I believe that for most people it is easier to accept advice anonymously than to receive it in person.

But how has he so quickly abandoned his knowledge of us as to accuse us of such folly and contempt for the divine laws? For what reason, also, does he protest so strongly of our mediocrity? Or rather, who has exalted him to such a wondrous height that even when we say nothing he still hears and when we have not entertained a thought, he, as though from a watch-tower of his own imagination, knows and understands another's thoughts; as if he perceives another's heart and penetrates it better than others are able to know themselves? And did he believe that he knew more about men than the spirit that dwells in them? Even Paul did not hope for the existence of such men, nor did he attribute such knowledge to others.³

But whence is such folly poured upon our betrayal of the whole church, our contempt for the established laws? What have we done? What have we thought? Against whom have we spoken? Because let it not be thought and believed about those who accuse us that they have said nothing bad against us and have not put such insults in their own words. For it is not the words that give weight to the meaning; it is rather the bitterness of the intention of the mind and the evil of the meaning coincides with the roughness of the speech, it makes no difference what type of words one uses.

On the other hand, if upon gazing on the wonder of evils which have been heaped upon us and the burden of the difficulties that encircle and trap us on all sides, he thought that we might weaken, he believed and alluded to human behavior; what else could one say to defend him? For excesses of suffering usually produce diverse changes and alterations in those who suffer.

He has decided that evil had greater power over us than he did over the righteous Job. The devil never got power over Job's soul, but he⁴ already had granted him the mastery of our soul. He clearly proves that he has thought and concluded this by accusing

us of pure folly, along with disobedience of the law. And yet, if he was led to this suspicion of us, he employs it as a backdrop for his other slanders against us. Now, setting aside the reasonable arguments and rhetoric, I believe that he, as a Christian, should not have attacked us, nor made our sufferings harder by inflicting common insults. Instead, with words of understanding and solace he should have tried to alleviate our pain, and in every possible way to find consolation for us.⁵ He, by exasperating, attacking and reproaching our miseries, is delighting in the sufferings of his neighbor, neither suffering with him nor feeling his pain. He does not act as our friends, but attacks us as would our enemies.

What really happened⁶ is that they emptied against us all the sediment of their wickedness. They have taken us away from our friends, separated us from our relatives, cut us off from each other, from you which for me is the worst of my sufferings; they stripped us of our servants and helpers, imprisoned us and placed guards and officers around making it impossible for anyone to express compassion for us in word or deed; they accused us of the myriad deaths of men of God and many others, and alas they even imposed starvation on us. They have continued to surround us with many evils and having attacked our sensibilities and they have assaulted them all, now they contrive new ways to attack each one.⁷

First, they have closed our eyes; what other explanation can there be when one is not allowed to set eyes on other men, nor permitted to have books, especially if one has reading as his first and greatest consolation?⁸ This restriction they imposed upon us in the Council.⁹ Secondly, they even closed our ears as they do not allow us to hear the voice of a friend nor even that of an enemy. What is fitting to be said? They could be forgiven if they let us read.

But as long as it is up to them, we cannot even hear people singing to God, nor chanting hymns of thanksgiving. Nor have they allowed anyone, for even the shortest while, to be with me; anyone who was even mediocre in singing. Oh, cruelty, dwarfing even barbarous behavior!¹⁰ And instead of priests, instead of friends, instead of monks, instead of chanters, instead of readers and scribes and of every one whom we are used to, who usually lighten the burden of the oppressed, we have soldiers and guards and military detachments. Why should I go into details and make my woes more acute by remembering them?

Furthermore, after they had attacked all our senses with contrivances of manifold evils, such was the extent of their deeds, they assaulted our very soul in its blamelessness; the most brutal and cruel of all the deeds that God abominates. They destroyed the houses of God, which we had established as a penance for our sins; they chased the lame and mutilated beggars away from their rest at the churches' hearths and divided their possessions as though they were the spoils of the foe.¹¹ And they beat the flesh of our servants with lashes so that everywhere on their bodies they made welts by the frequent whipping.¹² They wanted them to tell where the gold and silver was, which I had stored up; treasures those poor wretches had not seen in their dreams. Those who kept us confined knew better than the others that we were always being slandered about wealth. We never liked money as they did, those men of avarice, since for us it was forbidden to do anything absurd as to piling up wealth.

They repeated their wrong doings for countless days and nights. Still, although they knew this better than anyone else, they continued their ill treatment, not to really find out what they pretended to be looking for, but to grieve us, because they knew that what they were looking for did not exist. For they did not omit any form of ill treatment in their handling of me.

But I would not deny that Satan, for I do not know how else to term it, has contrived all of this and more than I have said; by such afflictions our enemies have driven us out of our senses and made us disdain the commands of God, and have turned us into common traitors. I do not know why anyone should accuse us of such things, nor why they should be so bitterly hostile against us, even our enemies. And if some one were to hear these accusations he would blush, shrink back, and deny that he would ever say anything like this against us, or even thought to say; as in doing it, it would be a great sin which even the creator of this life would not recognize; but our creator in his wisdom has implanted in his nature the responsibility of his deeds.

If then he claims that none of this came to his mind, but as is right, he condemns those who have dared such things to an awful fate and terrible curses, in the name of friendship you should ask him this: How does it differ to say of us all what he has said, and to say that we have become enemies and that we cannot tell the difference between friends and enemies? And whose friends does he mean? Oh, awful insult: Those who are friends of Christ and

those who are the enemies of Christ. For that is the conclusion of wishing to count us among the clergy who suffer for Christ; and those who fight us in the name of Christ. Our enemies consider the blood of his testament an ordinary thing,¹³ not to mention other matters such as the desecration of the altars of the Lord and the ridicule of the Holy Chrism, or rather the Holy Spirit, through whom the chrism derives.¹⁴

Ask then, again, I demand: what difference is there between them except in the degree of evil? And if he shows that they are slighter than the others, consider that I am talking foolishly¹⁵ and judge him worthy of receiving great praise. Indeed he has contended not that his insults were slighter than the others, nor that he has surrendered to others, the excesses of insults; but that he has said nothing which is really a source of blame for us. But should he show that his deeds are less than his praises, do not denounce him. On the other hand, if he does not show anything, as indeed he cannot show it, counsel him to keep silent and to remember my misfortunes on that score too; the revolts and insults of my friends assist the plots of my enemies. How then, can one upon saying or thinking such things as these, as that good friend imagined that we say and think, not arrive at the brink an arrogant condemner of the traditions of our fathers? And many other sins are included, such as lies, deceit, impiety, disbelief, struggles with one's self, and limitless abundance of evil. Did not the good painter use the best of colors to build our picture, and has refused to say anything bad against us? But more simply, let us heed what the Lord said: "So be wise as serpents and innocent as doves."¹⁶ But if it comes from wickedness, let us repent as we hear him again: "unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the Kingdom of Heaven."¹⁷ Especially we should recall what sort of punishment is in store for the man who scandalizes one of the lesser brethren.¹⁸ And if he who scandalizes just one person will surely be punished, the one who is shaking and disturbs the whole church, should reflect and think what kind of punishment he is liable to receive. Would that no one would be subject to such punishment, since we have Christ to protect us.

But how could I think of the above without tears and pain? If then he would receive those (he says) who are not fit to be received, who then should we not be among them? If, however, he would not receive them, in fear of the punishment to come and even against our will we will preserve our present piety.

What about God, my good friend? What about faith? What about the last judgment? What about conscience? What about truth? What about righteousness? Does not any of this concern you? Has Charybdis taken it all and engulfed it in oblivion?¹⁹ I, however, expected him to think and to say the opposite, since if he received those who are not fit to be received, then all of us would shout with a high and piercing voice. Nothing would be spared, not even the fatherly yearning for which we boast, not even the proper piety which we have been taught to show always towards our fathers, not even any other reverence which we reserve for him.

But, after we have gotten rid of all this which I have spoken of, we will shout with piercing voice. What is this that you are doing, Brethren? Where are you going? Don't you know that you are delivering yourself to your enemies? Why have you turned our struggles into follies? Why are you shaming the assembly of the pious? Why are you exalting the spirit of the foe? I hoped that he was going to busy himself in this kind of way, if he saw me making mistakes, and not act as he is now, mimicking the behavior of the frivolous. I hoped for this, so that an enemy of his some time would dare to say against him the same words he is saying against us, so that his enemy will pursue him, throwing stones at him, calling him liar, swindler, and other similar insults.

We are ordered to endure those who otherwise attack us, because we are followers of the calm and peaceful (master); but no one should endure those who are insulting the faith. Even He, who calmly put up with everything else and never fought back, threw out those who wanted to turn the House of His Father into a house of commerce after He had strongly censured them.²⁰ Those who blasphemed against the Holy Spirit He threatened with a twofold punishment.²¹ Here the punishment would be of fire, war, and famine for all therefore. He swore that those who had been driven out with great rage would not escape the punishment to come.

But with such hopes, it seems I nurtured myself into starvation. Who gave him information against us after we had sat upon the archepiscopal throne and taken into our hands the full power over action and purpose? For such rumors and inquiries (if they must be lodged against anyone) are grievous to those who have already gloriously and clearly grasped the reins of rule and have sat upon the common throne. Already the sinners are on their knees as

they wet the ground with a flood of tears and pour forth on their pleas for mercy. Those who have attained truth and virtues sit together garlanded with their glittering crowns and determine the appointment of judges. Then indeed, then, if it were proper, would be the time for these accusations and for their determination. But not now, not by having men suffer hunger, thirst, prison and so many other distresses, even those that involve life itself. For they are the ones who made the various determinations, and that was the right time, not the present.

But, my good and dear friend, if I should not now be accepted, how are you not ashamed to be associated with them? And do you see one who should be wearing a crown now among the prisoners?²² And do you dream of the mercy of others, while you betray and discard the generosity and freedom from above?²³ If you do not consider that it was not bad to associate with them, you should recognize that you are with them in thought. And though you reflect their deeds, you honor that flock which as you say instead of shepherds has wolves.²⁴ But if you prefer, you are, since you are there, more concerned about it than those who are in it. Because if some of them though they are there in body, have their conscience in conflict with their intentions, they still fall. You, however, beyond your bodily association with them, are anxious to share their thoughts and intentions. Whenever your association with them falters, the reason is your cowardice, not your piety, your shame, not your resolution. Who are you then? Are you one who did not even admit in a dream to being one of them, or are you one who has given fear as the reason that until now he has agreed with them, and who thinks it better to be disgraced with the enemy, lest he later suffer punishment, than to take the consequence and be completely admired among his own people. You then have accepted the wrong people and you are determined to destroy yourself. Words do not make deeds better; on the contrary, through deeds words can be clarified.²⁵

Let us suppose that someone sees bandits or traitors to their own people who are loathed and hated by everyone. Although he is not guilty of any of their crimes, he dreams and says to the keeper of the laws: "If you allow those men to go unpunished whom you should have executed, would it not be easier for me to become a bandit and a traitor in order to be pardoned? But if you punish them, in fear of it I will not imitate them." Would any one admit that these were foolish words, wrong opinion and many other things? What then? Everyone with sense will recognize and

understand his state. If, however, instead of traitors to their own people they are traitors to our faith; instead of thieves of our bodies they are thieves of the sacred laws and he were to bring them into our midst and shout the same things, will we not suppose that he would be condemned by the same margin or an even greater one on the part of the wise? Apart from what has been said, if they rule their deeds by ecclesiastical laws, what need is there for these untimely investigations, these struggles and drowning of thought? Why don't you quickly be conscious of their fate and demand great forgiveness for your slowness? If you are aware of men who have done unlawful deeds, why do you worry whether they are punished here or not? For, if they are punished here they will come out better, because by their punishment they will be purged of sin. If, on the other hand, they are not punished here, this makes them more wretched, because the punishment over there will be more bitter for them. So if one had to make a choice between the two, he would seem to have picked the lesser evil and to have looked after his own good if he had not avoided the punishment here (on earth), but by suffering here and now he had made the punishment over there (in Heaven). Just as with the sick man, it is not the one whom the doctors rescue from pain with their incisions and their cauteries whom we finally give up on, and know that he is in his last sufferings, but the one whom we see not responding to the treatment. And why would anyone make any account of the results of his own thoughts? These will make it easy for us to bear our present burdens with less trouble. These will be our consolation. With these, oh friend and brother, we have zealously tried to win you back. I do not shrink from the more holy words, nor do I give myself completely to what I have mentioned but what is not yet finished, and in hope I partake of the summons to betterment. "If the salt lost its taste, how shall its saltiness be restored?"²⁶ said the Lord. If this is what had happened to our friends, our brothers, our children, our own members, our very being for what is more sacred to us, by which it is still better to be in the flesh or rather freed from it and with Christ,²⁷ for whom I mourn and am saddened and my tears become my bread.²⁸ If then, this has happened to them, what need is there to look at the sorrows of others? But nothing is a wonder. I know what even the divine Paul was deserted in chains. "At my first defense," he says, "no one took my part," and "Luke alone is with me."²⁹ Everyone has patience and endurance. For this reason even the Lord, when

he spoke of the sorrows and temptations which were to come to those who believed in him, said: "But he who endures to the end will be saved."³⁰ I know also about the Prophet David lamenting the isolation of many and saying the following prayer to God: "Help, Lord; for there is no longer one that is godly; for the faithful have vanished from among the sons of men."³¹ And why do I say this or that? I know that our Lord and God, after he was arrested and was led to prison, was deserted by all. "Then all the disciples forsook him and fled."³² What is then so strange if we are also deserted, who are terrible and piteous among men, who cannot even breathe free air, men who live in prisons, and expect a thousand deaths every day, and have been deserted by any bright hope? Would you say that we have been deserted? But I wish we were only deserted, unbearable as that is. Because they are not deserting us but in our familiarity with the truth and right dogma of the Church, for which until recently they have suffered not a little, now they cut themselves off and make themselves outlaws. This then strikes and exhausts the soul. We see the limbs of Christ, the head, his partakers and sharers scattered and utterly destroyed.³³ But, even if the evil is unbearable, it can be borne from the examples which we have mentioned. Trying to charge us with the responsibility of desertion, (for which up to now no example has been found) how could anyone, even if he were practised in bearin gall, endure this?

I do not have the full recompense for my divine and paternal love for you and those spiritual, awful, and dreadful pains in which you, a luminary in the universe, were set in the mystical chamber of the church to preach the word of life.³⁴

These excellent things I am reminded of, through your admirable and divine conscience, how yesterday and the day before he provided us with entertainment and hospitality. He has tried to have our arbitration of his struggle as his retreat and retirement from shame and sin, if the opposite of what he expected did happen to him. For the lodging of a charge against another, if the scheme of slipping it in does not find any place, turns into a harsh indictment of one's own conscience. Why were you looking over there for an alliance, and trying to fabricate an excuse, as if you did not have your conscience as a bitter prosecutor of your will? Why don't you do to yourself what you are so anxious to do to others? And if canons of letter-writing did not exist, and the scribe's hand (and that a stolen one) were not in the way, I

could show with more precision and more detail our pain and the ways in which he has afflicted us. But how about his manifest confessions, which he has freely made in the presence of God and angels in front of all men, and kings, the rulers and the ruled. Isn't he going to be shamed by them? How was he not ashamed of the boasting of the Church³⁵ which has completely survived against time and insults? Would that with the help of the Hand from above, it would survive and triumph always! How then, only through him, did Satan find the way and choose in his own fall to destroy suddenly the general condition of the Church? Because the resourceful snake boldly tried to present something new to the world, but our maker, the creator of our nature, did indeed create something newer, more wonderful, and more divine.³⁶ Because Satan used men of the worst kind, completely without any worth, who from long time had been expelled from their ecclesiastical ranks and had been thrown out from ecclesiastical assemblies for reasons which we are not even allowed to mention, who have died twice and have been uprooted according to the apostolic proclamation about them as, "blots and blemishes,"³⁷ bold and willful men, he entered them secretly and used them as his own instruments of evil; with them he wanted, in his insolence, to destroy and take over the Church. But God, who, as it is known, alone can create wonderful things, and who strengthens those who ask for his help in sorrow, and then especially shows His ineffable and wise providence when from everywhere we are encircled by perils and fear, showed truly how the Church was built, constructed and actually rooted in Him, so that the evil one not only received a blow in answer to his evil action, but it was a more serious and painful one. For how is the wound to the Devil not very great and incurable when in such confusion, such chaos and change, no small man, no great man, no Metropolitan of an unimportant town, nor of an important city, no unintelligent man, no one armed on both sides with both fluency of tongue and readiness of wit, no one important in his life, nor famous for his dogmatic precision, absolutely nobody was changed by the crisis, nor gave in to the force of events? But simply all of them who join in the dance of piety (who, whether he heard of it long ago or hoped for it recently, would have believed it before it happened?) Were they not seen to master every trap of the Devil, every scheme, and every fabrication and violence of his?

It is very pleasant for me to examine these matters in detail and especially to you who had a great part in this miracle. Because

there is nothing more pleasant for fellow combatants, especially when they are deep in sorrow, than to tell each other about their victories in battle. But as I was saying, the evil one was boasting and bragging that he would swallow all down in one time and prove the accomplishment of his knavery. But the holy assembly of the Church so greatly mocked and laughed at his knavishness, having Christ as their general and leader, that they were able to capture some of them and lead them to the truth, having not even one of them become a fugitive from their excellent formation. Thus, if someone gave the Devil the right to choose which of the two he would prefer for finding vessels like those which he has found which could store all his energy, and on the other side to find the church, opposing him with such bravery and steadfastness, and breaking these vessels as if they were made of clay, and with them crushing their maker, or not to have either experience; he would rather prefer not to have the good fortune to find such vessels and not to dream of the joy he would receive because of them, nor to see the church become stronger and more flourishing and inflicting a bitter and crucial blow against him, and raising a shining banner against his power. For this reason and not for any other, he ought now also (because I don't know how to say it without bringing more sorrow) be utterly put to shame and not try to take away the crowns of victory from his own head. Why indeed, since he did not do exactly what he had planned, did he not help us with his hesitations? The careful attempt proved what was his intent, but the grace of God, with our welfare in mind, did not allow him to accomplish his intention.

But you, my children, in the future should not be concerned over any of this. Because now I have abandoned those arguments which have distressed and torn up my heart with worry.³⁸ What I have suffered, I will reveal, because even though the medicines and the surgeries are necessary, compassion overcomes the laws of medical education.³⁹ So I no longer endure the tyranny of sympathy; I have left all that and I am embracing you, my child,⁴⁰ as if you were here present, as if you were a part of my holy sufferings. Why do I mention this? Where is my pride in you? Where are my hopes? Or rather where are the deeds that have fulfilled the hopes? Don't you see my frowns, my dejection or, if you won't, my tears? My care for you is the cause of them. My pain for you touches my heart. Grief touches my life itself. But if you care for my life (and until now there is no reason to make me believe that you do not care), let nothing like this or even similar

to it be an object of your thoughts or concerns. Because blessed is the man who walks not in the counsel of the wicked, but who did not even travel in their thought.⁴¹ And we should not feel that we are good because there are those who are worse than we, but we should be ashamed if we are proven to be worse than some others. Because the best is not the one who is not seized because he has deserted his men, nor is he to be revered and admired because he has not been worse than the fugitives. But when he is the bravest of all his soldiers in the war and is victorious over his enemies, then he has the right to receive the wreath of victory. Yes, I pray and beg you, show that the end is worthy of the beginning, worthy of the struggles.

Oh! How many tears and sighs it costs to sail calmly the sea in the midst of winds and storms,⁴² only to capsize in the port itself, and on in battle to overcome the enemy but to be deprived of the trophies of victory, and to win victories in the stadium, only to faint right at the presentation of the wreaths.⁴³ You then, lovers of virtue, heralds of piety, and defenders of truth as in everything else, in my present sorrow I am going to find consolation in you. Not only because it is natural when sorrow is revealed to friends that it spreads somehow with the words and vanishes with them, but, more important, because I have very high hopes that your wise and good advice and thoughts will quickly cure the man; and make him turn his face completely away from the whispering of the serpent; and no longer will be accept any advice which does not agree with right intention and inclines to hesitation which is the reason for his fall, but he will return to his earlier perfection, and he will be unshaken and unmoved on the rock of the stable and uninterrupted confession to Christ in all his life, his words and actions.

But enough of this now. "So if there is any encouragement in Christ, (let us shout along with the divine Paul to you and through you to all men), any incentive of love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy."⁴⁴ So that just as up to now, even so you may be of the same mind in all things, struggling together in one spirit and one soul as you proclaim the truth, and not frightened in anything by your opponents. "This is a clear omen to them of their destruction, and of your salvation, an omen from God. For it has been granted to you that for the sake of Christ you should not only believe in him but also suffer for his sake."⁴⁵ And I do write this to you not that you need my words, but as your debtor urging you to join me as

the season demands, in your deeds and struggles and at times in your words: "But you have been anointed by the Holy One," (in the words of the theologian John) "but the anointing which you received from him abides in you, and you know everything and you have no need that any one should teach you; through Holy Unction you have become wise. Just as he has taught you, abide in Him, so that when the Son of God appears, we may have confidence and not shrink from him in shame at his coming."⁴⁶ For He is the Dispenser of peace and King, the cause and support of our life "for in Him we live and move and become alive;"⁴⁷ in whom we are bound with the unbreakable chains of love. He is the first and great Archbishop, Christ our true God, "who has made us his own people with his own blood and not simply just people but his beloved, a Holy Nation, a Royal Priesthood, with whom there is no variation or shadow due to change."⁴⁸ He will sustain us until the end without reproach, tightening us in the bond of peace and love and sustaining us in him and among ourselves in the unshaken and unmoved beliefs of piety. Having one and the same purpose, all of us anticipating the same goal, he will lead us toward rewards of our heavenly calling.⁴⁹ There, in Heaven, is the Church of the first born where there are the bands of the martyrs and the tents of the patriarchs; where no lie is honored before the truth, where there is no strife, no tyranny, no desperation. There is found deep calmness, the unimaginable beauty of truth not covered by any device. There is found absolute harmony and concord, the divine enjoyment and participation in these blessed and indescribable visions. There the perfection of this alteration is not hoped for, but it is already magnificently achieved, for the sake of which these present battles and imprisonments are ours and for which we suffer with great pleasure untold thousands of dangers and many deaths. St. Paul urges us to pray for Kings,⁵⁰ and Peter the first apostle commands: "Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme . . ."⁵¹ and again, "Honor the Emperor."⁵² Even before then our common Lord and teacher and creator, from his unbelievable treasure paid tribute to Caesar.⁵³ In action and by law he taught us to abide by the privileges which are assigned to kings. That is why we in our sacred and solemn liturgies offer prayers for our kings. For to preserve and maintain these privileges is right for our Christian kings, is dear to God, and is most suitable for us.

FOOTNOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. The first time Patriarch Photios was condemned by Pope Nicholas in Rome in 863. The Roman Synod excommunicated Photios and proclaimed Ignatios the rightful Patriarch. Second, in Constantinople at the Church of St. Irene in November 867. Photios was condemned and exiled to the Monastery of Skepe on the Thracian coast by order of Basil I. The Monastery's church had been built by Patriarch Tarasios, Photios' uncle, and was dedicated to the Forty Martyrs. Third, by the Synod of Worms in May 868. Fourth, by Pope Hadrian at the local synod of Rome in June 869. Fifth, by the council of Constantinople (Fourth Constantinople, the Eighth Ecumenical Council of the West, October 5, 869-February 28, 870).
2. Epistle of Patriarch Photios to Arsenios Monachos, Ioannes Valettas, Photiou tou Sophotatou kai Hagiotatou Patriarchou Konstantinou-poleos Epistolai (London, 1864), 427; Migne, PG, CII, 897; Montague, Photii Epistolae (London, 1651); MS. P II F Ivion, Epistle 175.
3. Mons. Jacques Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis Jesus Christi jusq' à present* (Rotterdam, 1699), 324.
4. Abbe J. N. Jager, *Histoire de Photius et du Schism des Grecs* (2nd ed.; Paris, 1854), 266.
5. Patriarch Photios brings up the point of his position as legitimate Patriarch and as head of the Church of Constantinople. The question of the pentarchy came up again at the Synod of 869 in Constantinople. The spiritual legitimacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople as equal to the other four was stated again during the above synod by the assistant of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Theodosios, and by Presbyter and Syngellos Elias who reminded the bishops present: "You know all of you why and for what purpose the Holy Spirit placed the Patriarchs as heads in this world, to solve and take care of scandals in the Church." Mansi, XVI, 318-19; also cited by Metropolitan Maximos of Sardes, *To Oikoumenikon Patriarcheion en te Orthodoxo Ekklesia* (Thessalonike, 1972), 247.
6. Hebrews 12: 23.
7. I Peter 2:13. The sentence concludes "or any other institution."
8. I Peter 2:17.
9. J. Schaft, "Photius and the Epanagoge," *BZ*, XLIX (1956), 358-400.

FOOTNOTES TO THE TEXT

1. The Greek text of the Epistle "To the Bishops from the exiled Patriarch Photios," can be found in Migne, PG, CII, 741, Richard Montague, *Photii Epistolai* (London, 1651), Epistle POD, Ioannes Valettas, *Photiou tou Sophotatou kai Hagiotatou Patriarchou Konstantinoupoleos Epistolai* (London, 1864), Epistle 146, MS. Iviron 684, 180-94. All the above texts have been studied and compared for accuracy by this author.
2. Patriarch Photios refers to this anonymous friend who is the cause of his many tribulations as "he" in many places throughout the letter. In this respect, the present letter reminds one of a Socratian dialogue.
3. I Corinthians 2: 11.
4. The anonymous "friend."
5. Patriarch Photios points out to the Bishops what the real Christian way is. Making his point, Photios drops the rhetorical style and begins to pour out his heart, his sufferings, and his tribulations.
6. The *μετέωρος δνομαστική* has been used here. The phrase begins with *ἔγω* and the verb in reference is about forty lines later. *οὐκ ἀρνηθείην*. Valettas, 474, line 18.
7. *Αἰσθήσεις*.
8. In two other letters Patriarch Photios makes reference to the sad fact that he is not even allowed to have some of his books with him. In a letter addressed to Spatharios Michael: "*στερήσεις καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἀρπαγαὶ βιβλίων* " In the second letter, to Emperor Basil. the Patriarch asks the Emperor: "*Διατί γάρ ἡμῶν ἀφηρεῖται τὰ βιβλία;* "
9. *Ψήφοις*.
10. Photios as the acclaimed orator is evident in this passage. This epistle as it progresses gives the feeling of liturgy in progression, which at the end climaxes as a Doxology in a liturgical manner.
11. The beggars were considered sacred in Constantinople.
12. *Χαράδρας*.
13. Hebrews 10:29.
14. Patriarch Photios, while in exile, was informed that the churches he had consecrated were torn down by order of the Emperor Basil. Photios wrote to the emperor a letter in which he reminded him that even the impious Emperor Leo X, when he had exiled Patriarch Nikephoros, did not destroy the churches dedicated by him. Valettas, Letter 218, Montague, YZ, Migne, CII, 765. Other letters of Photios on the same subject: To "Arsenion Monachon" in Valettas, 105; "Emmanouel Patrikion" in *ibid.*, 205, "Konstantinon Notarion, *ibid.*, 197.
15. II Corinthians 11: 21.
16. Matthew 10:16.
17. Matthew 18:3.
18. Matthew 18:6.

19. There are often references to mythology and mythical creatures in Photian letters.
20. Matthew 12:13.
21. Mark 3:29.
22. Crowns and rewards for the athlete which will be expected only in the next life is a frequent theme in Photios.
23. Colossians 3:1.
24. John 10:12.
25. In this passage Photios makes allusions to those bishops who have gone over to the side of the enemy from fear of punishment.
26. Matthew 5:13.
27. Philemon 1:22-23.
28. Psalm 42:3.
29. II Timothy 4:16, 11.
30. Matthew 10:22.
31. Psalm 12:1.
32. Matthew 26:56 and Mark 14:50.
33. I Corinthians 12:12-27.
34. Apparently he is referring figuratively to the pains of child birth in "giving birth" to these new priest-bishops. The "full recompense" will be his joy at seeing them mature. I Corinthians 4:17, Philemon 1:10.
35. Romans 1:17.
36. God created the priesthood.
37. II Peter 2:13.
38. Σωλᾶνα.
39. Among his other accomplishments, Photios had studied medicine.
40. One of the addressed bishops.
41. Psalm 1:1.
42. A touch of Poetry.
43. The imagery of the stadium, the arena and the athlete competing for the crown is repeatedly present.
44. Philemon 2:2; 3:9.
45. Philemon 1:28-29.
46. I John 2:27-28.
47. Acts 17:28.
48. James 1:17. At this point the Doxology begins with praises to Christ and the priesthood and then asking for reverence and respect towards the king as in the **Polychronion** of the Greek Orthodox liturgy.
49. Again the theme of reward, but only in heaven.
50. I Timothy 2:2.
51. I Peter 2:13.
52. I Peter 2:17.
53. Matthew 17:24-27.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

BOOK REVIEWS

Aristeides G. Panotes. **Paul VI-Athenagoras I: Peacemakers** (in Greek). Athens: Foundation of Europe Dragan, 1971. Pp. 262. 335 plates. Illustrated. Plus 1 record (33 1/3). 500 drachmas (in Greece). \$20.00 (in Europe). \$25.00 (in U.S.A.).

This beautiful large book, lavishly illustrated with color and black and white photographs, drawings, documents, chronologies, bibliographies, and notes, is, in a sense, an album of the impact of His All-Holiness, the late Patriarch Athenagoras I, on both Eastern and Western Christianity, and a tribute to the far-sightedness of this imposing Orthodox hierarch in his relations with the Church of Rome and in his persistent ecumenical efforts to bring closer together Eastern and Western Christianity for eventual union of the two churches.

Professor Panotes, the chief editor of the 12-volume **Greek Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics**, has worked closely with the late Ecumenical Patriarch and has made available to the reader a veritable photographic as well as verbal treasure recording vividly the ecumenical encounter between Roman Catholic Christianity and Greek Orthodox Christianity on the highest official levels. The book can be read in its entirety, used only for its pictorial review of the significant events marking the lives and work of Popes John XXIII and Paul VI and Patriarch Athenagoras I, or simply as a reference book of Orthodox-Catholic relations up to 1971. The text is divided into two parts: the first gives the reader a swift overview of the background and personalities of John XXIII, Athenagoras I, and Paul VI. The second provides a chronology of the events of 1958-1971 with excerpts from 180 pertinent documents of an official nature. The photographs are of four kinds: (1) parallel lives of the two Primates; (2) "the common journey of Rome and Phanar" 1958-1971; (3) works of art or piety exchanged or inspired by the events; (4) a supplement of photographs of 1970. Byzantine, Roman, Gothic, and contemporary art are inevitably represented. The small record attempts to record something of the musical traditions of Roman and Greek Christianity.

There can be no doubt that this handsome volume, which ought to be translated into English and into the major European languages, is a tribute to the far-reaching ecumenical efforts of the late Patriarch Athenagoras and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. It remains to be seen, however, how much of the foundations that he so forcefully and energetically laid will be added to, strengthened, and completed by his successors. The period of high level consultations, ceremonial occasions, and hierarchical exchanges would seem to be over—at least for the time being, and the hard work of the day to day implementation of the goals that have been set is at hand.

JOHN E. REXINE
Colgate University

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

RESTORATION AND LIBERATION IN AND BY THE COMMUNITY*

By EMILIANOS TIMIADIS
Metropolitan of Calabria

All the ancient baptismal texts give brief summaries of the qualities to be found in the newly-baptized Christian as he is inscribed in the roll of the community of the redeemed. By becoming a member of the Christian family, he is divested of the old man and clothed with the new man, in the image of his Creator. These texts also speak of the fact that the newly-baptized Christian takes on the same nature as Christ. He acquires the fruits of Christ's death and resurrection. At the same time, he is already inscribed as a candidate for eternal life: *ἀπογεγραμμένος ἐν οὐρανῷ*.

But this new-born Christian must be continually nourished and sustained. He needs a milieu, he needs solid food, if he is to remain sound. Otherwise, he is doomed to stagnation and regression. What practical results could the gifts grafted into him at baptism produce?

The believer cannot remain introverted and withdrawn. He must open out, make contact with others and be concerned for all, just as Christ did as man. He is called to follow his example and to imitate him. Since the Church, as a mystical community, warms and sustains him he too in turn must contribute to the progress of this community, to its betterment and enlargement, and he must go forward with it, influencing his milieu. He must be committed, he must be oriented to service, he must wish to develop *μὲρρωσις, ἀνακρίσεις, Χριστοθήσια* and to influence his milieu.

Faced as we are with a weakening of ecclesiological bonds, we shall have to aim at reaching once more a full awareness of the community of salvation. Christ was sent by his Father to offer to man, and to inaugurate in the history of man, in its full reality, a liberation which will finally embrace all generations of man. He was to sum up in himself the movement of creation so that it can find its fullness in the eternal life of God. In the historical

circumstances as they now are, communion of life in the Church ought to already orientate the life of all men to an ending of conflicts. We should all be striving to make our faith and our lives, our doctrine and our practice, form a consistent whole, by eliminating the scandalous contradiction inherent in a faith in God which would not be intent on reflecting the image of God on the City of man.

The divine mystery on which an education through actions can be based consists of the fact that Christ and those who belong to Christ form a whole, a seminal reality more substantial than any one of us, the whole Christ, the community, the living Church. Heaven and earth do not form two planes, one above the other, which do not meet. They do not make up two zones, one of which would be theoretical, reserved, beyond the reach of daily, historical experience, the other an everyday place, the zone of the ordinary, the ambit of our concerns. When heaven descends upon earth a major shock, a paradox, ensues. This paradox is a reality, the reality of the Incarnation of God made man, of the City of God built among men. Our actions must be organized as a result of this reality.

The distinguishing mark of this body of Christ, **σῶμα Χριστοῦ**, is its contribution to the world. Man-made institutions are no longer man's servants but his task-masters, while we are reaping the harvest of nemesis. But Christ offers all that we are in need of. Man is a Prometheus whose liver is being devoured each day by the vulture, while the gods replace it so that the vulture always has more prey.

St. John the Evangelist gives the guidelines for a theology of the Church (John 20:19-31). The Church is a model — **τύπος** — and should reflect the mysterious unity of the Holy Trinity. Just as the Three Persons have a unitary movement, so too believers are sent into the world to prolong this unity. The mission demands that they belong to the unity, which cannot be maintained except by constant communion with the Risen Lord.

It is to achieve this that Jesus gives the Church his own breath of life, the Spirit. The Spirit is granted in order to bring about the mystery of **καταλλαγῇ**—reconciliation. The pardon of God, whose work of reconciliation is universal, is channelled by the Church, by its faithful. If man is to discover his true nature he must return to the ultimate source of being. He must recognize the real and effective principle by which we live, in whose image we have been

fashioned, to whose influence we must expose ourselves to be confirmed more strongly in what we believe spontaneously: that it is better to reunite than to take apart, better to do than to undo, better to give than to take, better to love than to hate; and that peace is better than war.

In other words, to find the full meaning of reconciliation with others, reconciliation with God must first be achieved. God being the Source, it is from him that our effort must flow on every level, including the level on which we aim at liberating and renovating society.

It is Christ who gathers his people round his festive Table. There is a motive and a cause for the presence of the transcendent God, who unites his members by his presence. They are reunited in him as they are with each other. He re-establishes the Christian in his dignity. For having been reconciled, the Christian is endowed with forces and capacities so that he can become a new creation. He becomes a new man. He frees himself from the tyranny of his passions, from his egoism.

From the Orthodox point of view, the life of the Christian incorporated into the Eucharistic community goes through successive stages, which may be outlined as follows: first, to become truly a man, which constitutes an existential demand; then to return and rediscover the image of the archetype, to resemble and imitate Christ. The unimpaired and authentic man is a free being, not only in theory but in reality. The community to which he belongs makes for his sanctification. He is nourished to enable him to complete the upward path. Further, he cannot disregard his commitment to others, whether they are Christians of the same faith or others.

Renovation and Liberation: The Birth of the Eucharistic Community

The Church's assemblies, from the start, were looked on with disfavour by its enemies. The Roman emperors did not care how individual Christians worshipped. But once the scattered believers began to assemble in synaxis, the emperors began to persecute them. Pagans feared these gatherings, the prayer in common, the leiturgia of the people. For this common worship nourished an extraordinary faith.

The Emperor Decius, by his decree of 249, showed that he

understood that the suppression of community worship would strike a fatal blow at the Gospel. For he saw behind it the life-giving force of the Eucharist, stimulating and nourishing the souls of Christians by sustaining them in trials and martyrdom.

Thus the active participation of the believer in the Eucharist, is seen to be, from the theological standpoint, at the culmination of his growth in Christ. That is, when he is strictly upright in the conduct of his life, he lives in and by the Eucharistic sacrifice. He becomes then a soul offered and sacrificed along with the Immolated Christ, the unbloody offering, who offers himself with his body and for the body.

Thus, eucharistic community life aims at creating an *ecclesia*, a community united, reconciled, redeemed and liberated. Such a community has all the traits of new men who are purified, free, made other Christs, and, while detached from worldly things, still at the service the *diakonia*, of the world. Each one is a bearer of these signs which make him belong at once to the head and to others, to the mystical body.

St. Gregory of Nyssa emphasizes the fact that the faithful have not kept the Gospel message to themselves, but have spontaneously spread it among others. Man's dignity is to be found in sharing, in a community. He restores by grace what he has been robbed and stripped of, what he has lost. In other words, the Christian regains his wholeness as a human being, ridding himself of what is deformed and corrupt in his nature. St. Gregory of Nyssa describes the process as a retracing of steps, *παλινδρομησις*.¹ The Christian leaves the desert and sin, entering the fertile land, with its gladdening fruits, where honey and milk flow according to the promise of the Bible.² Once he has been touched by the saving word, he distances his soul from the pleasures of the world. Like a runner who has discarded all the weights which slow him down, he becomes light of foot, a well-equipped athlete covering the distance of the spiritual races, following the example of the leading runner, Christ.

The Fathers of the Church place great stress on man's incorporation into the mystical body of the Church. Outside, he is exposed to all the dangers. "The door is now open."³ "Enter the place you left", says Gregory of Nyssa, "Eat well to strengthen your soul. Taste a mystical drink which gladdens the heart."⁴

One sees, therefore, that the Christian community is not just a human assemblage. The faithful find themselves gathered together

there, summoned by Christ, invisible but showing himself through the Eucharist. His members are not restricted to a union of solidarity and comradeship.

By being linked to Christ, man finds his own being, his identity. Christ then speaks in him, the Lord who became incarnate, who died and rose again for man's salvation. Christ discloses himself to him and discloses to him what he really is. During this integration and incorporation, the Church speaks to him of the true man which he could be and which he desires to become, though he does not always recognize this. Man wears a mask continually and hides his heart, though he fails nonetheless to convince others, for all are more or less equally well schooled in this lie and they cannot fool each other for long. However, in the pursuit of this vain goal, man loses himself, and his spendthrift efforts bring with them the chastisement of a ruinous void and a meaningless life. Christ enables us to discover our true value, in contrast to what we wish to appear. He reveals to us that the image of our inexpressible glory has not been erased by the wounds of our falls, our indifference to our destiny, our refusal of salvation. He reveals to us our fellowship with the divine essence. He enables us to discover that we are children by grace, members of his mystical Body. He tells us that our efforts make it possible for us to be what we aimed at becoming, a reality far superior to the appearances we put on, like the face of a child rather than a painted and indecent mask.

This ascent of man is determined by our belonging to the Church as an organism living and growing by the charismatic action of the Holy Spirit. If the bond with the Church is broken, the person who leaves it, isolating and enclosing himself in his smothered egoism, will be deprived of the influence of the Spirit who lives in the Church. It is in these terms that the teaching of the Fathers links pneumatology and ecclesiology.

St. John Chrysostom regards any separation from the Church, the sacramental community, as the loss of the grace of the Spirit:

Imagine a hand separated from the body. The spirit which comes from the brain finds its passage cut, but does not leave the body all the same to rejoin the hand. If it does not find it within reach, it does not impart itself to the hand . . . The same thing happens when love no longer sustains the link between us . . . So if we wish then to enjoy the Spirit who comes from the Head, let us link up with each other. There are two ways of finding oneself separated from the Body of the

Church. One is when our love grows cold, the other when we perform an action unworthy of this Body. In either case, we separate ourselves from all that makes up the Church.⁵

These ardent words are a clear expression of the idea that an individual and even a community can only live insofar as they draw on the life of Christ. Insofar as they are united with the Church universal. To be isolated, to be closed in on oneself is the equivalent, for an individual member or a local Church, of a ray being separated from the sun, a brook from the source, the branches from the tree-trunk. The spiritual life cannot be there, and its vitality cannot be displayed except in organic union with the whole Church. If this union is broken down, the spiritual life becomes anemic and atrophied, and inevitably departs.

St. John Chrysostom expounds again and again the qualities of the Eucharistic community. This is not just any assembly, a sentimental life-sharing group in which pious people gather, withdrawn from the world to give themselves over to visions and contemplations excluding other interests. It is the place where salvation is perfected, where man ascends to his ancient glory and discovers his immense potentialities, placed as they are in the general service, for the good of all.⁶

St. Basil lists the fruits produced by this local community and even describes its true nature:

People of different countries and races find themselves united in such mutual resemblance that they can be considered as a number of bodies inhabited by only one soul. They are servants equal to one another and masters also equals. They have their freedom, and they turn it, as we see, into service of each other, which is in no way forced on them but is given most exactly . . . This I describe as a perfect way of common life where all sense of ownership is eliminated, all diversity of opinion excluded and all causes of dispute or conflict are avoided.

They have everything in common; soul, body and thought. In common they have God, in common they have the object of their piety, in common salvation, in common the ascetical struggles, the arduous labour and the reward.

The union of all means that they form one person. No one is alone, but each is part of all.⁷

As one can see, the secret of such a miracle, of such fraternization, is the harmony of a common life animated by Christ,

nourished by grace through participation in the Eucharist. Many have failed to understand this, by virtue of the law which says that the solutions to the gravest questions are generally the simplest answers, which are not understood because of their very simplicity. Reforms on the sociological level will remain ineffective as long as basic, radical changes are not made in the soul and in behaviour. And the remedies are always the same: the ministry of the word which prepares the way to Faith with the aid of the Eucharistic communion.

Evidently, since the Church is a mystery linked to the Incarnation of its head, its members also continually live out this mystery. By virtue of his nature, his conduct, his aspirations, his goals in this life and the life to come, the Christian is faithful to this mystery and adheres to it in all his actions.

The high-lighting of the incalculable value of man before God, and of his divine mission in the world, form a characteristic feature of Orthodox anthropology. However, the warning to be cautious, the realistic anticipation of the fearful dangers continually threatening man's existence, in the world, are also a feature of an honest diagnosis. These dangers are such that man's life in the world becomes a veritable balancing-trick. What St. Gregory of Nazianzus has to say on this point is characteristic:

"We all know that acrobats on the high tight-rope find it dangerous to lean to one side or the other, even to a slight degree. Or if it seems only slight, it is only their balance that gives them assurance. In the same way, if anyone leans to one side or the other, by his malice or ignorance, there will be no danger for him and for those who advance towards the fall of sin. But by following the middle path, ὁδῷ βασιλικῇ πορευτέον, 'they will not turn aside to the right or the left', as the Book of Proverbs says. St. Paul expresses the same notion more simply, when he exhorts 'any one who thinks that he stands to take heed lest he fall' " (I Corinthians 10:12).⁸

Then, this deviation is considered to be always on a par with the personal position of the one who has a fall, in the Church. Hence this Church is always of personal importance. Man's balance in his tight-rope walk through the world—between his dilemmas and his choices—is assured by a number of things. First, there is the awareness of the inclination to evil which we all have, and of the downward pull exercised on man by the world, this being another law of universal gravity. Then there is the

continuous exercise of spiritual control over the carnal, in the life of the Church, following the examples set by the great athlete of the faith, the martyrs, confessors and saints.⁹

Communion with the grace of Christ takes on indefinable dimensions, both inside and outside the body of the Church, by reason of its invisible and mysterious nature. It even becomes communion with the mystery of the Holy Trinity, in the world and throughout history as a whole. This communion, besides bringing about the personal salvation of Christians, creates conditions of a more and more spiritual character, for the salvation of the whole world. Thus, the Church becomes the net cast by God (Matthew 13:47), that is, the concrete expression in history of the love of God, always sacrificed for the salvation of all. Nonetheless, the world which is the object of the Church's mission hates the Church, not because the Church wishes to save the world but because ". . . they are not of the world" (John 17:14-15). But Jesus Christ wishes his Church to be in the world. "I do not pray that you should take them out of the world, but that you should keep them from the evil one" (John 17:15).

The body of the Church contains some negative elements. And it often goes through serious crises and even sees many storms ahead, whipped up from within and from without. But it never ceases to be all that God ordains for man in the highest spiritual realm. As regards these negative elements in the organism of the Church, St. Basil remarks:

In reality, it is hard to find and very unusual to meet a loyal Church which has not suffered detriment from the difficulties of the times. But it preserves intact and inviolable the apostolic teaching, such as has enabled us to recognize the Church in the present time, the doctrine which has been noted by those who merited its call among the people of each age.¹⁰

Personal responsibilities are involved in the crisis within the Church (see Matthew 18:7; Luke 12:47; 17:1). But they may also be described as the historical prolongation of God's extreme tolerance, and again, as the progressive birth-pangs of the world in the Church. The agony at the death of the old man is, as it were, the outward sign of the struggle and combat which the members of the Church are waging against the forces of evil. Above it all there is the perpetual overflow of God's love; the eternal image of the perfect goodness of the Holy Trinity.

The Liberation Initiative and Our Response

Social evils and sin are closely linked. From the Book of Judges on, a cause of evil situated on another level is revealed. When Israel abandons Yahweh to prostitute itself in the service of Baal, it comes under the sway of its enemies. Because it refuses to be converted, Israel is invaded by Assyria and Babylonia. Jerusalem is captured, the temple destroyed and the people led away into captivity. The sin chastised is not only the abandoning of the true God, it is also injustice against men. The oppression of the poor draws down God's punishment.

But because God is love, he takes the initiative to save his people (Exodus 3: 7-8; Isaiah 54: 7-10). However, man is allotted a part in his own liberation, in two ways. He must accept it as God's gift. And he must also throw himself heart and soul into the action that saves him. In Israel's combats during the period of Judges and Kings, and in the return of the captives, one can see that God alone is the Saviour. But salvation does not come about automatically. It demands man's fidelity and his cooperation with God's action. The Fathers expound the notion of *concursus* (*synergia*) as the base where the two dispositions meet, that of God and that of man.

The problem of salvation, according to St. Gregory of Nyssa, is the taking of the initiative by God. It is he who takes the first step to draw man closer and make him emerge from his tragic deadlock. It results from the unique action of the Word of God, as he "undergoes", as we affirm, "fellowship" (κοινωνία αἰώνων) with "man". Christianity, that is, salvation, is more than a simple message. It is not the transmission of thoughts and reflections of great value, of a philosophical point of view. We are not dealing here with a mere ideology, but with a new order of things, a new creation, which takes place in the very nature and essence of man. In this sense, Christianity does not simply rely on a transmission of words, on mere "doctrine" (διδασκαλία). While due importance is attached to teaching, the religion of Christ is based on the continuity of his Incarnation, on all that has been created by him who humbled himself and condescended, offered himself to us, mingled with us, "so that we too, by mingling with the divine, should become divine."¹¹

The working out of salvation is not in the main the result of a doctrine. It is rather the outcome of all that God has done on

man's behalf, by the fulness of communion. He has given life to life by his work. Having taken up flesh into himself and divinized it, he wishes the whole human race, assimilated to himself, to be saved along with him.¹² This firm law does not confront man with a teaching, a corpus of doctrines, but with a present and permanent event which is of unique importance for his existence. Man is not called merely to implement a certain doctrine, but to accomplish a unique act of "affinity" (*συγγένεια*) and "imitation" (*μίμησις*).

Salvation is offered as an act comporting "a similarity of action in the follower to the actions of his leader", *ὁμοιότης ἐν τοῖς γινε- μένοις παρὰ τοῦ ἡγουμένου πρὸς τὸν ἡγουμένον*.¹³

Seen in this light, the baptismal rite of "the descent into the water, accomplished three times"¹⁴ during baptism is not a spectacular and empty action. It is closely linked to all that the Lord had done. "It contains the mystery"¹⁵ through which life is produced and the new man, belonging to God and of his family, is newly created. "What have we seen in our head, apart from our salvation? We know that he was three days dead, and then again living. Hence something similar must take place in us (*καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιννοθῆναι ὁμοίωμα*).¹⁶

Baptism presented as the "imitation" of Christ's death and resurrection appears for the first time in St. Paul. The classic text is in the Epistle to the Romans, 6:4-6, "Baptized in Christ Jesus, it is in his death that we have been baptized. We have therefore been buried with him through baptism in death so that just as Christ has been raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too should live in a new life. For if we have become one being with Christ by a death like his, we shall also be so by a resurrection like his."¹⁷

This parallel is not confined to the Epistle to the Romans but extends to the whole thinking of the New Testament. This substantial relation between baptism, death and the resurrection of Christ is pre-established, as a basic element, in the whole of the New Testament.

"In the pursuit of the worthless, they have become worthless!" (Jeremiah 2:5). Jeremiah tells us why our life is compounded of worthlessness, of wind. It is because we have devoted ourselves to the search for this worthlessness and so harvest the wind. (We become worthless because a search for the worthless goes on in our lives). And we are thus able to discern a law of man's

development in its negative aspect but which allows of a positive formulation: in the pursuit of him who is truth, man becomes true.

Man is gradually assimilated, as it were, to what he pursues in depth. We take on gradually the consistence of what we are devoted to. We discover a direct corollary of this law: man is responsible for what he becomes since what he chooses to honour and search for makes him so. This can go on at the level of the conscious or the sub-conscious.

This enables us to understand more clearly this spiritual law, this invitation given in the New Testament to imitate and follow Jesus Christ. This invitation forms the basic thrust of the mysticism of St. Paul, mysticism of imitation of Christ in the pursuit of Christ, when one becomes what Christ is, that is, Son of God, Truth. It is a question of achieving likeness, in the strict sense, of gaining the consistency of the true man by striving to identify dynamically and effectively with Christ.

How consistent is this law with what man is? Man is a premature thing. We do not adjust at a stroke to the reality of the world. We must pass through a necessary stage of education, acculturation. The animal, on the contrary, is in harmony with the world. It is at home on earth in a material universe, its true setting, while man asks himself questions, is uneasy, does not know if he is in his proper place. This primal lack of adaptation in man is shown on various levels.

As regards man's knowledge of the world, one might ponder the slowness of all mankind's attainment of objectivity, in scientific knowledge of the universe. The world is not what our eyes see (an infra-red photograph, for instance, gives us another vision of the universe). Our intelligence only adapts extremely slowly to the real and wanders through many detours.

The same holds good for the education and training of our desire. This training is summed up as follows by Freud: the tiny baby has to make the passage from a life dominated by the pleasure principle to a life dominated by the principle of the real. We launch out from an unreal universe to find footing, bit by bit, in the real world.

Free without Being Freed

Many labor under delusions as to the true meaning of freedom. Now, man is not actually in the state he was when he came from

the hands of his creator. A rupture has taken place between him and his maker, which has led to his being deformed and to a malfunctioning of his will and liberty. He often chooses something contrary to his interests. He acts in such a way that he searches for freedom by becoming the slave of his nature.

Modern man no longer adores the gods of heaven, whether they are called Jupiter or Jehovah, but his own scientific and political achievements, since he is unable to live within a world without a tinge of the sacred. People hardly realize this, thinking that religions are a thing of the past, while all that they have done is to shift the element of the sacred elsewhere. Instead of recognizing it in the churches or on the altars, they honour it in the streets during the large-scale liturgies celebrated by the totalitarian powers, or when sensual or mouth-watering advertisements go to their heads.

They are unaware of both the changes and the permanent. They talk like free-thinkers from the universities and have no misgiving in making fetishes of objects. The human race, however, cannot live in the harsh, rarified atmosphere of reason and reality. It needs ceremonies, prayers, miracles, a biological communion with itself and the universe. Not so long ago, nature was the source of the sacred, which impressed its rhythm on life, from birth to death, according to the movement of the recurrent seasons. But modern man's deepest experience is no longer that of nature. From the time he is born he sees and knows nothing but an artificial world. However, if nature abhors a vacuum, man finds the evacuation of nature still much more horrifying. So he uses urban civilization to create dreams once more, to satisfy his need for the mighty and the marvellous. *A priori*, there was nothing to prepare technology to become religious. But once it denies and shatters the ancient forms of worship, their free energy is channelled back into the new meaning which technology gives for the world.

The more highly society is organized along liberal and autonomous lines, the greater is man's temptation, desire and need to explode in anarchy against it. The rationalism of his works forms too strong a contrast with the urges of the flesh. Under the guise of permissiveness, sex in turn becomes sacred. For it rejects the technocratic order, just as technocracy challenged the dogmas of traditional religion. The sacred always evokes the sacrilege. But once "free" sex becomes the recognized and standard negation of

the economic order, it is in turn integrated into a consistent and hence accepted whole.

To announce that the rogue elephant must be tamed—meaning what society and the economic mechanism have become by placing them at the service of man—what else is it, if there is no component of religious faith, but to retrace one's stone; It would be to make a fresh start from the better to go to the worse. To say that one day, thanks to man, history can be re-written, begun all over again, is to say that man needs more than man.

There is no such thing as collective liberation from oppression, without personal liberation from sin, without confident acceptance of the message coming from on high. If we have faith, in spite of nagging doubts and dark patches, we have not to invent a Church on a human scale, but to make the Church's mystery our life and to be united, one and all, in hearing the Church.

Though the Christian does not remain unmoved at the sight of injustice and so many other evils in society, he does not let himself be ensnared by messianism and revolution on the social and political level. One truth brought out by the teaching of the Fathers is that a prodigious liberating force emanates from Christ crucified. His Passion is the sign that heralds his Resurrection. Appearing with the features of a crucified slave, Christ uses no external force to compel anyone to acknowledge him. His power and his glory are displayed in the act of faith and of freely-given love. The Crucified appeals to the liberty of the human spirit.

St. Paul has painted the most grandiose fresco both of the depth of tragic alienation in sinful humanity, and of the radical impact made upon it by the liberation effected in the death and resurrection of Christ. Going far deeper than any alienation on the social and political level, the radical alienation of which sinful humanity was the victim came from its being cut off from God by sin. Cut off from God, humanity was seen to be cut up in itself into hostile fractions, and the cut went deep into each individual, down to his inmost self.

God alone could be the Liberator, when the alienation was so radical. He alone could provide it with a radical liberation; a liberation also surpassing infinitely all relative and superficial liberations. It is participation in the very life of Christ the conqueror, participation in eternal life, according to the theology of St. John.

Must we then say that the freedoms in worldly terms to which

men aspire are foreign to the liberation achieved in Christ? By no means. For this freedom affects the whole man, created in the image of God. For the eschatological hope, founded on faith in the resurrection and in the accomplishment of the divine promises, likewise becomes, when correctly understood and deeply lived, a powerful factor in building up a responsible dynamism in history. Faith in the freedom achieved in Christ is a summons to take active part in similar movements of emancipation, where relationships affecting the daily lives of each individual are the goal. Theologically, it is imperative to underline strongly both how the first demands the others, and how the two forms of liberation differ.

Rather than call Christ "Saviour", as is usually done among Orthodox, we draw on our hymnals for the term "Liberator" (*Ἐλευθερωτής*). The two words have no doubt the same fundamental meaning. But at a time when the desire to be free is making itself very urgently felt, the change of name seems to have the advantage of enlivening our personal faith and of affirming that in our eyes the radical liberation of man has been achieved in Christ.

It is impossible to speak sincerely about human emancipation while allowing doubt to hang over the meaning of what one wishes to say. Freedom is mentioned in many connections, and certain freedoms are desirable and possible in different degrees, while others are impossible. The efforts to realize the latter would leave man in a totalitarian strain-jacket.

Some speak of a liberation from God, from the Absolute, as if one could exist without him and cut away the branch from the vine that gives the sap. To try to free ourselves from our right and authentic nature and the laws which are given us brings with it the risk of the direst slavery. The better we are, the freer we are. We must make ourselves better. Man struck a mortal blow. His condition was such that there was no point in fighting what was left. It had to be re-established. Christ took up the cross of our sins and man was free to free himself, not from the cross, but from sin, by the cross. There is no freedom without a previous constraint freely undertaken, any real and deep freedom is the abatement of sin, and by the same token, of its effects.

In the struggle against injustice, the struggle against the sins which are the cause of injustice has priority. And in spite of life's overplus of dramas, we must never forget that it is worse to

commit injustice than to suffer it. Injustice is an evil. To suffer it is not a blessing. To fight it is a duty. While we have not to give up the struggle against its causes, we can fight injustice along with those who only know the effects, that is, the actual injustice done.

"It is not my nature to hate but to love."¹⁸ This intimation from the conscience, affirmed by Sophocles' Antigone in the fifth century B.C., is transformed into certainty by the believer. In the confusion that besets human affairs, where everyone sometimes loses his head, it is well to recall, that, as Sophocles says "of the gods": "The unwritten, unwavering laws of conscience"¹⁹ sometimes take precedence over public interest and political law.

In this struggle against injustice, we must ally ourselves with others, reserving however the right to make sure that the goal ultimately served by each one is not simply an extra injustice. Any real struggle here implies the refusal of a greater injustice. All stand for justice, but the claim to fight injustice is not enough.

There are freedoms to be won. Let us strive to see that real freedoms are granted. We must not forget that freedom is a force, a heavy responsibility, or it is nothing. To be in the service of man, without forgetting tomorrow's men, does not mean that we share the mistakes of our times, the causes of injustice. It means struggling to free men from the illegitimate hindrances which prevent them developing individually or as a body their native qualities; to free them from all that separates them from Christ, the sole Liberator.

At one time or other all philosophers, both rationalists, and theists, have come up against the practically insoluble problem of freedom and determinism, which appears to be still more acute in the desacralized world of nature as it is today. Now, basing ourselves on a close and complicated exegesis of biblical texts dealing with this problem of creation and the theme of the Exodus, as the liberation of man by Moses at the direct and miraculous intervention of God (outside nature), we are invited to reconcile these two terms, which are rigorously exclusive of each other.

They do not belong to the same order of things, one order being natural, the other supernatural. That of the created world provides, in its continuity, a way to discover its finality, as the reality in which we live—our lives—unfolds. We can thus break down the supposed antinomies which oppose man's and God's freedom and the determinism in which we imagine we live.

The Proof of Our Liberty

Mankind is on the way to creating a One World in a way which has never been known before. Barriers are falling, religious, cultural and national discrimination is disappearing and the one thing that emerges triumphant is that men are living together as brothers. Futurology explains to us how man is responsible not only for himself as an individual and for his present state, but likewise for his fellowmen and his future. This future is determined by what we do and what we plan at present. *Rebus sic stantibus*, "as things stand," and palpable tendencies are the principle in which we proceed. The trends are based on what is actually going on and give us to think that the tendencies now perceptible allow us to foresee the future and the way in which humanity will be in the future. The starting point of *rebus sic stantibus* provides the only really valid presuppositions and constitutes at the same time the weakest element. Freedom is a risk, because it can be abused. Fellowship is a risk, because of the discrepancy between the ideal and the actual. The feeling for humanity is a risk, because of the lack of a Christian humanism and the thrust of egoism.

The truth is that man is only man inasmuch as he is a believer. The forms, the way in which he practises his faith may change and even disappear. But however things may stand, he will display his inherent longing for the eternal and imperishable values of the religion of love. Christianity is not like other religions. Its originality consists in the fact that it proclaims the direct intervention of God in the world and in the history of humanity (*oikonomia*, *philanthropia*). Jesus entered upon the scene of history by his Incarnation and still continues to work there through his Church—*Christus prolongatus*.

On the other hand, to try to rid the Church of the common touch in order to keep only the spirit of love; to see in the Gospel only a call to social revolution is to misunderstand it just as much as those who aim only at their own salvation and their personal piety, imagining that one can be a Christian merely on one's own behalf. In this connection, the teaching of the Fathers reminds us of the doctrine of the *concursum* (*synergia*). We believe in God, but we also believe in man. Much depends on man and his character. We are threatened at the present time with a "private" Christianity, a "private" faith, a "private morality", preserving nonetheless an outward show of piety and even still linked in part to a

Christian commitment.

The totality of human needs was never lost sight of in the Gospel. Its message was spread by human means. Its action has not been limited to the religious level. The Church did not do its work of evangelizing by bringing civilization, but it brings civilization by preaching the Gospel.

If Christ frees man from the anguish and unrest of daily cares, the believer, according to St. John Chrysostom, must equip himself all the more efficiently to avoid being submerged in the doubts and bewilderment engendered by the successive difficulties which he has to face. "We are not created to eat, drink and dress ourselves, but please God and receive the heritage of the blessings to come" (Homily on Matthew, 22:3; PG, LVII, 303).

We need to be well fitted out for such a difficult march. St. John Chrysostom insists strongly on reducing the necessities of life, since setting them too high would be detrimental to freedom. He refers to an example used by the Roman philosopher Epictetus: "Anything beyond the necessary becomes the enemy of the necessary itself and by the same token, useless."

If you try to wear a size of shoe too big for you, it will trammel your gait. So too, if you own a house bigger than suits you, you will not be able to rise to heaven."²⁰

All those who rid themselves of the superfluous and of an excessive search for comfort are free (εὐλutos) to march ahead and reach their goal. Diogenes himself, as we know, had little concern for material things, being afraid they would be detrimental to his freedom.

St. John Chrysostom, when discussing the hierarchy of values, takes up the questions put by certain people when faced with the varying and even contradictory views put forward about life's priorities. Why is this one rich, it is asked, and that one poor? Why is this one in misery, though a just man, while the impious prosper?

In the eyes of the great Patriarch of Constantinople, the real difference between men comes from the quality of life, the amount of virtue in men: τὰ διαφέροντα ἡμῖν ταῦτα, τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς. He sees, nonetheless, that attention is concentrated on such differences as are basically unimportant in classifying men, while the true causes which make people different are neglected.

In a word, what distinguishes us, in this life, is virtue and the

goals of our existence. And it is precisely this false attitude which causes so much confusion in the order of values and criteria. This is the course of the anguish, of a behaviour full of frustration.²¹

Hence the Christian community is not anchored to riches and power to assure its security and to live tranquilly in the shadow of the Church. It has to be on the alert, keeping a look-out, and must show this fellowship (*koinonia*) in a concrete and effective way. It must devote itself in every possible way to lessen social evils, to relieve suffering and to decontaminate the polluted and toxic atmosphere, by preaching fraternity.

Who can believe in this incredible mystery of redemption, salvation, *kenosis*, if the people involved, the communities, do not make it manifest by their actions? The mystery of salvation is channelled by the community, the members of the body of Christ. If these believers, the components of the *pleroma* of the Church, are not the first to undergo and undertake radical changes, then we are betraying the ecclesiology of the parish.

Society needs a new type of relationship. Otherwise it will produce a train of miseries and disorders which would be hard to bring under control. As we face a spate of utopian notions, one fact stands out so clearly as to be unmistakable: the world is looking for a soul. This society which is heading towards the destruction of man and his environment—in a process linked with the waning of the formal influence of Christianity—needs more than man. Man appeals from his fate to man. One day, perhaps, man will be helped by himself to have some respect for man.

We must bear in mind the need to shatter our egoism, to renounce our selfish comfort, to break off any too exclusive an attachment to our material possessions, whether they are plentiful like those of the rich Zacheus, (Luke 19:2), or like those of the poor widow praised by Jesus (Matthew 12:34). In the picturesque language of his day, St. Basil was already preaching as follows to those in easy circumstances: "The bread that remains uneaten in your house is the bread of the hungry. The tunic hanging in your wardrobe is the tunic of the naked. The footwear that remains unused in your house is that of the poor who go barefoot. The money that you keep buried away is the money of the poor. You can tell how many injustices you commit by counting the benefits you could bestow."²²

Living Communities Wanted, but Above All, Living Members

Man redeemed by baptism and the Eucharist is called to a crystal-clear way of life. This leads him along the line of a crest between two great abysses. On one side lies the abyss of sin which makes us lose the dizzying vision of its terrifying and fatal death. On the other is the abyss of love, of grace, of the action of God offered to our freedom.

The freedom which should be directed in a headlong rush towards the ocean of salvation is termed *metanoia*, the reversal of a psychology bedded down in disordered habits, an easy prey to its own instinct, to its own selfish hand lower passions, and its redirection to our true life, to God. This is the subjectively decisive moment of re-conversion, whose essential function is to provide the truest and strongest motives for the conscious sorrow for personal defects. These motives are the offence given to God and the breach effected in the ecclesiastical communion, as well as regret for the unworthy manner in which the personality itself, made in the image of God, has been profaned.

Faced with the obstacles in the world, and with a human nature so hardened that it is resistant to the Good, many people wonder whether the struggle for the cause of charity and salvation is still worthwhile. The good finds its ways blocked by evil and the presence of God, the Pantocrator, in the concrete circumstance of life, is no longer so keenly felt as in times past. It is not true, in reality, that God is absent from the world. It is we who are absent from him and fail to cooperate. We are not sharing the common task, which is to renew human life.

Time blunts all edges, even those of our most cherished resolves. Nothing keeps, unspoiled, not even God's presence within us. If we correct the trajectory of our journey so as to be orientated interiorly and externally towards the Creator; if we have firm hope, and a charity equal to all trials in spite of all possible disappointment; then we shall be bringing Christ into focus.

To give new vigour to our life and to restore its unity to the world, real togetherness, "concord of sweet sounds", doctrinal and Eucharistic, with the Head of the mystical body, Christ and his Church have pride of place. For us Christians there is only one source of unity, Christ, and one place of unity, his Church. Too often, we split over a personal choice contrary to a decision

taken by the Church. In the old days, the name of "heresy" was given to the action, choice (αἵρεσις) or one-sided personal opinion, adopted without reference to the general consensus. We have to make an effort if we are to transcend our personal views and chime in with those of the Church. The communion and the true liberation held out to us become pipe-dreams if they do not start from an interior renewal, personal disciplined effort and renunciation. However, they become a real prospect if we know how to walk in the way traced by the "condescension" (synkatavasis) of Christ, on which St. John Chrysostom wrote so copiously.²³

One result of this is the practical character of theological virtue, that is, of the "love that is according to God". The morality taught by the Eastern Fathers links the theological element very closely to the soteriological element. Our adoration of God, the confession of faith, in the truths of our salvation is not seen merely as a metaphysical doctrine interesting only the "specialists". Dogma is meant for everybody. It has to do with my salvation, but always in relation to the salvation of my fellowmen.

In other words, it is the theology of love, implicitly at work, that determines my personal position in the world and also my relationship to others, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Otherwise, I shall end up with a system that has no foothold in the real. Moreover, the aims of the renewal set afoot in the theology of the liturgy are to display man as an active member of the Church, as the dynamic carrier of the living Tradition. The miracle of Pentecost should be a sustaining force at all times, and a constant call to the colours, so that each one may spread the news of God's marvels and tell of the might of the Spirit, as the needs of the times demand.

In this way, the believer will use his own personal experience to demonstrate the might of the great truths of our salvation. If he lives in awareness the interior life of the Church, he must externalize the fact, and manifest it by his actions and in a language adapted to all men's comprehension.

Man's encounter with God and other men is aided by the mission of the Church. This relationship depends on the extent of man's relationship with God. The great ascetic, Nilus of Sinai, in order to demonstrate the sacred character which should accrue to the believer's relationships in society, reminds us that we should see the image of the Creator in others, whether they are men or

women. "Your neighbour should be another god, after God."²⁴

Moreover, if the hermit withdraws from men's company, he does so in order to combat their enemies, the demons. The Evil One has to give more of this attention to the ascetic. By neutralizing the demons, the ascetic does the world a service, provides the example of a triumph over evil, encourages the faint-hearted "to work out one's salvation"²⁵

means forgetfulness of self, self-denial and the offering of oneself for the service of others. This is what characterizes the life of monks. "To work out one's salvation" also means to imitate the activity of the Holy Trinity, "offering and offered" continually for the salvation of the human race.

There is still room, however, for a feeble type of love. It is possible to love God without loving one's neighbour. Nonetheless, my personal salvation is quite impossible unless I show some interest in the salvation of my neighbour. The horizontal and the vertical lines of morality meet. Love of God and love of the neighbour are mutually complementary.

The greatest enemy among us is the lack of an adequate and substantial communion. The outcome of this lack is an imbalance in our activity and a weakening of our unity. Just as poor circulation of the blood results in imbalance in the overall functioning of the human organism, so too, in the case of the Church, lack of communion among its members triggers off an imbalance in the whole organism of the Church. This communion should not be confined to the leaders, it must also extend beyond them to take in all the agencies in the Church, as well as each group of the faithful. Otherwise they become isolated and head for death.

At the present time, this communion seems to be suffering from a serious drop in voltage; that is, it is badly atrophied among the clergy and the rest of the faithful.

A substantial and complete communion among all the faithful of the Church had as its fruit that faith and life found expression in a way that was *ὁμοθυμαδόν* ("of the same") and *ὁμόψυχον*, ("in the same spirit").

Pitfalls for Community Solidarity

Awareness of the mission of the Church, the community of salvation, calls for a maximum of vital activity on the part of its members, the enhancement of creativity. Faith in Christ can only be lived in community, not only in the fundamental framework of

the Church universal, but also in the interplay of personal ties with other Christians near to us.

The practical difficulty presented by the special features of our problem is that the community is involved in the various sectors of civil life, without thereby becoming a politicized community. To do so would entail a perversion of its nature as a Church community. It will be unable to devise the correct line to be taken, or if needs be, switch back to it, unless it is determined to be, in the communion of the whole Church, essentially a community of living faith: a community nourished by the word of God, a Eucharistic community.

The more fully the community rediscovers faith in its authenticity, the more keenly will it be interrogated by that faith. It will become all the more dynamic, active, source of light and life for itself and for each of its members. The word that comes from God is a summons which he addresses to his people and to each of us. One needs to know how to discern its impact on the responsibilities incumbent on us, to live the faith as a pledge to transform ourselves and the world. St. John Chrysostom affirms that "a truth as overwhelming as our real unity in one Body should have equally real consequences in our daily lives."

To establish the value of parishes which have no connection with the institutional Church and the traditional type of parish, stress is laid on the fact that they have features of their own which have a stronger appeal for modern man. These features are worth looking into, in no cursory way.

These basic units are complementary, and their interplay, some people are convinced, holds out hope of a new ecclesiastical structure being established . . . They bid us hope that the "non-parish" will save the parish, that life will well up from the latter and that it will experience a prophetic awakening, that the celebration of the Eucharist will correspond to the aspirations of the group.

In this connection, the essential ecclesiological element of the parish must not be lost sight of. It is not a matter of any ordinary sociological grouping. It is a Eucharistic assembly. It is not the mere fact of forming a group that confers authority on it, but Christ and his representative, the bishop, insofar as the assembly is in communion with them. In reality, it is Christ himself who calls us to this *συναξίς*. It is he himself who sets up this Eucharistic *ecclesia*. This assembly, *συναξίς*, is not congregationalist in character, but pneumatological.

A parish may be flourishing, but this is not enough to make everyone feel satisfied. If it may be affirmed that the general interest is not the sum of individual interests, then, conversely, the prosperity of the whole does not guarantee that of each individual, at least to the extent that the individual hopes to benefit by it. And this is a point which the teaching of the Fathers has not failed to remark. They pointed to the pre-dominance of egoism, to how much, too often, is earmarked for personal gain in what is of itself a legitimate striving: the search for a fair distribution of the fruits of salvation, the spiritual blessings flowing from the Cross, from the Saviour. Patristic ecclesiology underlines the truth of interdependence, since we all form the mystical body of Christ.

What it condemns here is above all the falling off in community spirit. The rule of *agape* is on the wane. A line of conduct is adopted where each one is on his own, thinking only of himself.

All that is envisaged is the local group of believers, a Church geographically demarcated. For too long, it has been forgotten that there is a distinction between the individual, the simple numerical unit, what might be termed the statistical item, and the PERSON who is a unit in the community, but who only exists insofar as he accepts his actual responsibility with regard to his milieu.

Our society has been mainly concerned with the good of the individual, or, to be more precise, with his prosperity. It has not asked itself whether the beneficiary is likely to have a sense of responsibility, strong enough to prevent his using his possessions to the detriment of those around him. Thus, society has failed to be vigilant enough to safeguard the specific character of the PERSON as a spiritual entity. And, by the same token, it has failed to safeguard the delicate tissue of relationships which make up the weft and warp of the fraternal texture of the community. The community spirit demands that each member be considered a partner. Unbridled numerical expansion can be harmful to the community spirit, since it results in splits. A spiritual crisis and painful experiences sometimes prove to be salutary, since they cleanse the body of toxic elements accumulated in the course of furthering an unhealthy overgrowth.

At the present time, religious duties are frequently identified with what is done to promote social solidarity. An attitude of this type is based on some isolated texts of the bible where God

affirms, "It is mercy I desire, and not sacrifice."²⁶ There is certainly a confusion here. What the bible aims at denouncing is formal, punctilious observance of the letter of the law while works of charity are neglected. It denounced the one-sidedness, the dichotomy, by which faith is separated from acts of charity.

This same attitude is also voiced in another way, when the duty of adoration is considered to be fulfilled in the social sphere. This will not do either. For such an argument fails to take the religious element into consideration, and Christian solidarity is debased into being a merely social and humanist phenomenon.

The Fathers, nonetheless, are far from belittling the works of charity. St. John Chrysostom constantly emphasizes the idea that concern for the poor is of the same value as religious assemblies and ranks as highly as they do: "Charity is a sacrament. So shut your doors, so that no one can see the objects that you could not put on show without giving offence. For our sacraments are above all God's charity and love of mankind."²⁷

Obviously, this holy Doctor of the Church is not trying for a moment to substitute works of charity for the sacraments of the liturgy. Hence he goes on to deal with the catechumens and the Eucharist in the course of the same sermon. His aim is to combat formalism and to show that works and prayer go together, to complete each other.

It should be noted that St. John Chrysostom, in spite of his insistence on the need of being pointed heavenwards continually—just as the magnetized needle of the compass marks the north—does not let himself be preoccupied with the things of heaven to the detriment of the things of earth. The two factors should be combined, he recommends, in a harmonious synthesis which corresponds to the two-fold needs which exist in man:

For we must desire heaven and the things of heaven. But again, he has commanded us to make a heaven of earth before gaining heaven

He then goes on to display the dimensions of Christian concern. It is not limited to any given place, or number of objects, or acquaintanceship. Charity and solidarity should be unlimited, unbounded, without any frontiers to narrow and pin down our activity. We shall take in the whole universe with no regard to places, persons, races, languages or nationalities. "Our Lord has commended each of us who pray to take on the provident care for the universe. For he did not say, "Thy will be done in me or

in us', but, 'everywhere on earth', so that error should be expelled and truth implanted."²⁸

Confessing Christ to Men far and near

Once the Christian has been engrafted into the mystical body of Christ, he transmits all its qualities by channelling them in all directions. Even where there are errors, he tries to eliminate them and build the bridges of love and reconciliation. One then sees the miracles of his action and his mission. Frontiers supposed to be impassable begin to vanish, and passages open up where they could hardly have been said to exist. From its very start, moreover, the Gospel, has been the greatest bridge-building enterprise.

There is an urgent need to rebuild bridges between those who not long ago were strangers to one another, Christians and non-Christians, the fringe elements of society. Leaving behind the bloody quarrels of the past, we are now taking part in a strange encounter where the Christian world is coming together, sharing a common front against practical materialism. It is delightful to see that the sections are being readied from both banks and already joined up to become the bridge of friendship for mankind's salvation.

No one is in possession of truth. On the contrary, it is truth that takes possession of the man who is loyally seeking Christ's message. Then comes a dangerous temptation, that of intolerance, or, if dialogue takes place, that of the preconceived notions. The debater is less interested in listening than in asserting himself, not so much trying to enlarge his mind as to plant and dig himself in among ready-made convictions that he has never re-examined. Monologue after monologue follows, with no speaker answering another, since they do not listen to what the other says, each of them being eager to hammer in his own truth and yearning to have the upper hand. They are soloists on different wave-lengths.

Some people appear to be unbelievers, but hidden deep down within them there is an intimate contact with their Creator. Clement of Alexandria was quite correct in pointing to an inviolable and universal law of human nature:

From the beginning, there existed in man an innate tendency to communicate with the divine, just as he also sought to reach heaven. This tendency was hidden at the time in the darkness of ignorance. But suddenly, it stepped out of the shadows and began to shine and radiate brilliantly.²⁹

St. Basil likewise notes the same phenomenon in the ancient

world, which was at heart a world of great faith, though outward appearances were deceptive: "In all rational creatures, the desire to offer praise to God has been implanted by nature."³⁰

What will happen when the day dawns that will see the antagonists ready, as they exchange ideas by word of mouth or by writing, to give reasons for the ideas they put forward, and explain them not just in terms of reasoning, but also in terms of the history that led them to think in this way? To listen to each other in this way, with respect and Christian charity, a stronger bond than any ideas, is the primary requisite, if disdain and intransigence are to crumble away, rebuffs to be ruled out and points of view to converge.

When the day comes, the river, far from being a barrier, will have so many bridges that it will be a bond of union between the two banks, with the soil thriving on the same water. The Church will never be content to work only on an élite. The fringe elements of society also belong to Christ. They can only be won over if there is a non-schizoid preaching of the Gospel to transform them, which means a united Church. It is this secularized milieu which has to be made livable, which needs an apostolate of love to change it.

Everyone now admits that industrial growth and the population explosion are a menace to nature and animal life. And in fact, if man is deprived of his indispensable partner, nature which his own moral nature needs, if he is left to himself and at the mercy of his own growth, he is doomed to multiply in ever greater misery, till he pines away in a reinforced-concrete hell. To be exact, when we speak of "nature" we mean not only the animal and vegetable world, but everything outside it and inside it. This notion is posterior to the other, and comes into focus as man organizes his activity systematically and becomes independent of his milieu.

Nature is the vis-à-vis. Man needs others to reach full maturity, to transcend himself, to find his equilibrium. We cannot be the masters of our fate except insofar as our passions comprise the component of moderation. This can only be respect for the other, a loving, not an oppressive respect. Among men there is so much in common and so much essential similarity that the difference between men cannot be underscored without a perversion of human relationships. Hence man's only recourse against his own infirmities is love of nature, and a holy respect for nature will be the final criterion of civilization. It is not a question of turning

back, but of getting out of a cul-de-sac. The leap to take man out of this dead-end situation can only be made if the effort is made to reach a less narrow concept of the universe in which we live.

In reality, our present world is the same as the world of the past, in spite of the changes in many situations that the old world knew, in spite of the astonishing achievements of technology and in spite of the fact that the tempo of life everywhere is going faster and faster. The words found in Isaiah, which run as follows: "As the heavens are far from the earth, so are my ways far from your ways, and my thoughts far from yours" (Isaiah 55:9) will be always relevant to man in this world, and above all coming up to the last judgement, as is also clear from the context of the Book of Revelation.

Living in these modern times, man is offered an abundance of precious things such as he had never within reach before. Nonetheless, not being spiritually prepared beforehand to take advantage of these new privileges, man has not only built up many dangerous situations simply by using these gifts, but has become in addition arrogant, vain and haughty. Intoxicated by his enjoyment of these good things, he denatured all his spiritual desires and even the natural functions of his existence. Thus he broke the ecological laws of nature, and the moral law, paying no heed to his responsibilities and to the discipline demanded by life, and he set up a train of destruction everywhere. Thus he sapped and keeps on sapping the foundations of his own existence and thereby his environment.

The dialogue between Orthodoxy and a world out of joint and in a state of chaos should aim at restoring to the world the harmony and equilibrium now threatened by the void of dehumanization. Orthodoxy should bring all to see that the human being is of inestimable value, and that this value is now in greater danger than ever before in its history. Orthodoxy should enable quality to take precedence over quantity, being to prevail over knowing and having. Furthermore, it should enlighten men's hearts so that they will prevent the build-up of situations where the love of Christ has no place.

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

*Presented at the Orthodox Conference on "Confessing Christ Today," Bucharest, Romania, June, 1974.

FOOTNOTES

1. **Sermon on the Dead**, PG, XLVI, 524.
2. **To those who Delay their Baptism**, PG, XLVI, 421.
3. **On the Beatitudes**, PG, XLIV, 1297.
4. **To those who Delay their Baptism**, PG, XLIV, 417.
5. **Homily on Ephesians**, II, 3.
6. **Homily 4, Sermon on Lazarus**, PG, XLVIII, 1037-38.
7. **Homily to those who Leave the Divine Synaxis**, PG, XLIX, 353; **Ascetical Rules**, XVIII, 1-3, PG, XXI, 1381-84.
8. **Apologetical Discourse**, 2, 34, PG, XXV, 441.
9. Cf. Leontios of Byzantium, **Against the Nestorians**, PG, LXXXVI, 1489.
10. **Epistle**, 251, **To the Ephesians**.
11. **Gregory of Nyssa, Catechetical Discourse**, 4-6, PG, XLV, 65.
12. *Ibid.*, 85-88.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. **Antigone**, v. 523.
19. *Ibid.*, 453-55.
20. **Homily on the Statues**, 2, 5, PG, XLIX, 42, **Epistetus, Enchiridion**, 39; **Clement of Alexandria** takes up the same example in his **Paedagogus**, 3, 7, PG, VIII, 609.
21. **Homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians**, 29, 6, PG, LXI, 247.
22. **Homily 4 in Luke 12 18**, PG, XXI, 275.
23. **Homily 17**, 1 on **Genesis 3·8**, PG, LIII, 134.
24. **On Prayer**, PG, LIII, 134.
25. **Philippians 2:12**.
26. **Amos 5:21; Matthew 9:13**.
27. **Sermon 71**, 4 on **Matthew**, PG, LVIII, 666.
28. **Sermon 19**, 4 on **Matthew**, PG, LVII, 279-80.
29. **Protrepticus II**, 25, 1.
30. **On Faith, Discourse**, 15, PG, XXI, 464.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Demetrios Z. Sophianos. **Ἅγιος Νικόλαος ὁ ἐν Βουναινῇ. Ἀνέκδοτα ἁγιολογικὰ κείμενα ἱστορικαὶ εἰδησεις περὶ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Θεσσαλίας (I' αἰών) .** Athens, 1972. Pp. XI, 210. 14 plates. Paper. [St. Nicholas of Vounaina. Unpublished hagiographical texts (and) historical information concerning medieval Thessaly (X century)]

Although the life of St. Nicholas the Young is not unknown—there have been seventeen editions of his *vita*, the first published in Venice in 1657, the last in Athens in 1967—no one had submitted all the extant hagiographical texts to a scholarly treatment. This was the task the author set for himself, one he has executed in a patient, exhaustive, and scholarly manner.

After a careful analysis of the basic texts, which are reproduced in an appendix (pp. 139-91), Mr. Sophianos provides us with accurate data concerning the life of this Neomartyr of the Orthodox Church. In addition, we gain some interesting historical information concerning the province of Thessaly in the beginning of the tenth century.

Briefly, the main elements in the life of St. Nicholas the Young are as follows.

He was born in "Anatolia." Because of his courage and virtue he came to the attention of emperor Leo who appointed him *taxiarches* of the military force stationed in Larissa, Thessaly. There he trained his soldiers in "the fear of God" as well as in military science.

While emperor Leo and his brother Alexander were "on a military campaign in Asia Minor," "Avars" attacked Larissa, which they found virtually "abandoned and deserted." They proceeded to sack the city and to put to the sword its remaining inhabitants and those of the surrounding area.

Meanwhile, Nicholas and his troops had taken refuge on Mount Ternavon nearby, where they "fasted and prayed." Later they descended and engaged the enemy in battle. Successful at first, they were ultimately defeated. The captives, which included Nicholas, were to be put to torture and were urged to abjure their faith. Nicholas managed to escape and took refuge on Mount Vounaina where "he prayed and fasted." After some time, he was recaptured by an enemy patrol. Again he was submitted to torture in an effort to force him to deny his faith in Christ. He remained steadfast and was finally stabbed to death with his own spear.

After Leo's "return", the enemy abandoned Thessaly. Metropolitan Philippos of Larissa returned to his see and "received instructions from God" to bring the body of St. Nicholas and his fellow martyrs to Larissa. Thus Nicholas was joined by SS Harmodios, Gregorios, Ioannes, Demetrios, Michael, Akindynos, Theodoros, Pagkratios, Christophoros, Pantoleon, Euodios, Amilianos, Eirene, and Pelagia, whose relics became a great "source of healing."

While the body of St. Nicholas was still on Mount Vounaina, Euphemianos, who had been appointed *Dux* of Thessalonike, became ill with leprosy. He tried to gain a cure by visiting various shrines, all of which proved ineffective, including that of St. Demetrios. While visiting the shrine of St. Achilleios, the

latter "appeared to him" and advised him to visit the relics of St. Nicholas on Mount Vounaina. He did and was cured instantly.

The historical data that emerge from the *vita* are as follows. St. Nicholas the Young's martyrdom, previously dated by others from as early as 720 to as late as 1694, is now determined to have taken place in 901 or 902, that is in the reign of Leo VI (886-912), who together with his brother Alexander are cited in the text.

The *vita* was written sometime in the middle of the tenth century, that is, after Leo's death (912) and before the body of St. Achilleios was removed from Larissa to Prespa, Bulgaria by tsar Samouel during his invasion of the Byzantine Empire.

Nicholas' rank of *taxiarches* is the earliest mention of this office in Byzantine history while *Dux* Ephemianos is the first *Dux* of Thessalonike known by name. Previous to this we knew of Gregorios Taronites (989-996).

The author identifies the "Avars" as Arabs after examining and rejecting all other possibilities: Slavs, Bulgarians, and Hungarians. The Avars, of course, had been destroyed by Charlemagne. He also rejects as unhistorical Leo VI's expedition in Asia Minor and dates the destruction of Larissa in April 901 or 902, that is a few days following the destruction of the city of Demetrias by the Arabs in April of the same year.

Mount Ternavon is the present day Mount Melouna, near the present day city of Tirnovo, named after the mountain and does not derive, according to the author, from Turkish. Nor was the city built by Turhan Bey (1423) as was believed hitherto.

In addition, the author rejects as inaccurate all the variants of the name Vounaina which he believes to be the correct form.

It is interesting to note that despite his great popularity in Thessaly and the surrounding area, where churches were built and icons painted in his memory, St. Nicholas the Young remained a "local" saint for centuries. He was first included in the *Menaion*, published in Athens in 1895.

N. M. VAPORIS
Hellenic College

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Metropolitan Maximos of Sardeon. **Τὸ Οἰκουμενικὸν Πατριαρχεῖον ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ἑκκλησίᾳ.** Thessalonike Patriarchal Institute of Patristic Studies, 1972 Pp 389. [The Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Orthodox Church]

The present study goes over much of the same ground as does the **Historia tou Oikoumenikou Patriarcheiou** of the late erudite Metropolitan Gennadios of Theiron and Helioupoleos. The study, however, by Metropolitan Maximos is superior in a number of areas, possessing greater unity and finer clarity which results in generating greater interest. Written in a lively and scholarly manner, it examines the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its privileges in six chapters, with Prolegomena and Epilegomena in Greek and French. The bibliography is extensive, composed of Greek, Russian, French, German, Latin, and English primary and secondary sources. The author's principle purpose is to demonstrate that the Ecumenical Patriarch never has nor does he now consider his privileges as *ipso jure*, or that he is a "universal bishop" enveloped with a dogma of infallibility. His jurisdiction, the author argues in a persuasive way, is determined conclusively and witnessed clearly by the sacred Canons and by history. The Ecumenical Throne views these privileges not as a means of satisfying its own ambitions and of imposing absolute authority upon the Orthodox Churches and their faithful. Instead it exercises these privileges in humble service (*diakonia*), in the spirit of love, peace, and mutual respect for the glory of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Consequently, the Ecumenical Patriarchate is **Supra-national**, a principle to which it has been faithful throughout the ages and one which it continues to hold today. Of special interest to the author is the presentation of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod (451) and the interpretation of its 28th canon, particularly the phrase "in the barbaric lands" which is relevant to the Orthodox churches in the **Diaspora**. Metropolitan Maximos believes that the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate very early in history extended outside the confines of the Byzantine Empire. To these "barbaric nations", the Great Church of Constantinople preached the Gospel and brought to them spiritual and ethical values of a higher civilization. Thus the primary motive behind the various missionary activities was not political nor diplomatic. Further, unfolding historical events in the East have demonstrated the wisdom and the need for the decision taken by the Holy Fathers of the Synod of Chalcedon. In addition, the 28th canon was enacted in order to insure the seniority of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the East. Consequently, the seniority of the Church of Rome was not *ipso jure*, and her Primacy was due not to her undisputed ecclesiastical and moral position but also due to political considerations.

The author maintains against Troitsky that the term **barbaros** has a geographical meaning (52nd Canon of Carthage). Further the term **ethnos** must be understood to have a topographical connotation. St Chrysostom in his 11th Homily on Ephesians treats the term with the meaning of eparchy. The same is true of Socrates and Sozomen. And the term is used with the same meaning by the 2nd canon of the Second Ecumenical Synod (381). The author includes the views of modern historians and canonists who agree

with him, and then concludes as follows: a) the Church of Constantinople occupied the first ecclesiastical position in the East, ever-expanding its administrative and juridical boundaries; b) any land outside defined ecclesiastical boundaries belonged ecclesiastically to the first Throne of Constantinople, and c) the Church of Constantinople in this capacity accepted the right of appeal (**ekkleton**) from clergymen who belonged to other ecclesiastical jurisdictions, which explains why the Russian and other Orthodox Churches have from time to time appealed to her.

In addition, the author discusses the meaning of the supranational character of the Church of Constantinople. To him supranational does not mean inter-Orthodox in its narrow sense, that is to say, that the Church of Constantinople serves only as a liaison. (**Syndesmos-Ekklesia**) in the relations of the Orthodox Churches. Rather, since the Church of Constantinople is the Mother and First Throne of the Church, she is the Orthodox spiritual unifying force. Supranational, therefore, means the perpetual initiative towards a Pan Orthodox spirit and mission. Every action of the Ecumenical Patriarchate must be based on the conscience of the **pleroma** of all Orthodox Churches, while at the same time it is an expression of its spirit. He denounces **phyletism**, which was condemned by the Synod of 1872, and considers it the greatest single obstacle in the relations of the Orthodox Churches and an enemy of their unity.

The eminent Metropolitan concludes his study with this thought: "The Ecumenical Throne has always been conscious of the true meaning of its mission in the Orthodox world and never acted in a neopapal fashion . . . To this day it remains steadfast to its commitment of an ecumenical mission . . . and does not shrink from its role in assisting Churches in their relations and in seeking greater unity among themselves."

It now remains for someone to translate this serious and worthy study into English so that it will have a wider circulation. For it makes a definite scholarly contribution and can serve as a much needed guide for those who believe that the Ecumenical Patriarchate is not a supranational but nationalistic. Furthermore, it should be required reading for all those who plan to participate in the upcoming Pan Orthodox Synod because it discusses many topics placed on the agenda.

GEORGE TSOUMAS
*Holy Cross Greek Orthodox
Theological School*

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 1

SPRING, 1974



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 1

SPRING, 1974



Published by the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College
Brookline, Massachusetts

Ideas and opinions expressed in any Article appearing in this REVIEW are those of the Author of the Article, and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editors

Copyright 1974, Hellenic College

Published by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U S A

Printed in The United States of America

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Official Publication of the
Holy Cross School of Theology
Hellenic College



THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS, Chairman, Board of Trustees
THE RT. REV. BISHOP IAKOVOS of Apameia, President
THE REV. STANLEY S. HARAKAS, Dean



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor
THE REV. NOMIKOS MICHAEL VAPORIS
Associate Editor
THE REV. GEORGE J. TSOUMAS

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS
GEORGE S. BEBIS
THE VERY REV. MAXIMOS AGHIORGOUSSIS
THE REV. THEODORE G. STYLIANOPOULOS
DIMITRI ZAHAROPOULOS
ALBERT STONE, JR.
THE REV. GEORGE KARAHALIOS

Business Manager
THE REV. JAMES G. CARELLAS



EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

MILTON V. ANASTOS (University of California, Los Angeles)
GEORGE G. ARNAKIS (University of Texas)
PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)
DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS (Stockton State College)
DENO J. GEANAKOPOLOS (Yale University)
GEORGE A. PANICHAS (University of Maryland)
JOHN E. REXINE (Colgate University)
PETER TOPPING (University of Cincinnati)



THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is a publication for the exchange of scholarly papers and reviews in the fields of Biblical Studies, Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical, Archaeological, and Philosophical Studies.

A subscription to the REVIEW costs seven dollars per annum. The price of a single number is four dollars.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, requests for advertising and subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be directed to the Editor of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146.

All MSS submitted for consideration by the REVIEW should be typewritten double-spaced; and all notes and documentation should be separately paged. Articles are approved for publication, or rejected, by the Editorial Boards. Rejected articles will be returned to the Author only if the latter has supplied a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The REVIEW is published twice yearly, Spring and Fall, by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146. It is indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, and *The Index to Religious Periodical Literature*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

The Notion of Historicity and the Critical Study of the Old Testament GEORGES BARROIS	7
A Monothelite Kontakion of the Seventh Century L. WILLIAM COUNTRYMAN	23
Byzantine Burial Customs: Care of the Deceased from Death to the Prothesis JAMES KYRIAKAKIS	37

BOOK REVIEWS:

Paul VI — Athenagoras I: Peacemakers, by Aristeides G. Panotes Reviewed by JOHN E. REXINE	73
Guidelines for Orthodox Christians in Ecumenical Relations, by Robert G. Stephanopoulos Reviewed by VASILEIOS ISTAVRIDES	74
Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes 16-40, II, by Johannes Koder and Louis Neyrand Reviewed by EVA CATAFYGIOTU TOPPING.	76
Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist, I; On the Person of Christ, by Marjorie Carpenter Reviewed by EVA CATAFYGIOTU TOPPING.	78
Introduction to Saint Gregory Palamas, by George C. Papademetriou Reviewed by JOHN E. REXINE	81
The Holy Mountain, by Constantine Cavarnos Reviewed by JOHN E. REXINE	82

Τὸ Οἰκουμενικὸν Πατριαρχεῖον
ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, by

Metropolitan Maximos of Sardeon

Reviewed by GEORGE TSOUMAS

84

Ἅγιος Νικόλαος ὁ ἐν Βουναίνῃ. Ἀνέκδοτα
ἀγριολογικὰ κείμενα ἱστορικαὶ εἰδήσεις περὶ
τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Θεσσαλίας (I' αἰών), by

Demetrios Z Sophianos

Reviewed by N M VAPORIS

86

SUPPLEMENT PART II

Code (Γ') Gamma of the Ecumenical Patriarchate
 NOMIKOS M VAPORIS

S-3

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

Constantine Cavarinos. **The Holy Mountain.** Belmont, Massachusetts: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1973. Pp. xi, 172. Hardcover, \$6.00.

Anyone familiar with the work of Dr. Constantine Cavarinos knows the prodigious service he has rendered and continues to render those interested and committed to Orthodox Christianity and Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies. His latest book has all the fine characteristics of previous volumes: clarity of written expression, a straightforward, economical style, well ordered organization, and firm grounding in original sources. This is Professor Cavarinos's second book on Mount Athos (**Anchored in God**, originally published in Athens in 1959, has experienced excellent circulation and wide acclaim) and is an important contribution to Athonite bibliography. The three major portions of the book have been well rehearsed and well researched. Part One, "Scholars, Missionaries, and Saints," was originally delivered as a lecture at Yale University on October 21, 1968, sponsored by the Yale Orthodox Christian Movement; Part Two, "Music, Musicians, and Hymnographers," was written for the Colgate International Students Forum and the Colgate Orthodox Christian Fellowship Symposium on Mount Athos on May 15, 1969, and considerably augmented for publication; Part Three, "Recent Visit to Athos," was written in 1965 when the author last visited the Holy Mount and added significantly new material that had not previously been included in his work on Mount Athos. In addition, notes, a "Menologion of Athonite Saints" (a list of the saints of the Mountain according to the months when their memory is celebrated), a glossary, a bibliography, and an index round out this conveniently arranged volume.

It is perhaps important to point out that Dr. Cavarinos's book includes the first comprehensive survey of the scholars, missionaries and saints of Mount Athos and the first attempt to discuss the music, musicians, and hymnographers of Athos in a somewhat extensive and systematic manner. The 1965 pilgrimage conveys communications from the Holy Mount regarding the monastic attitude toward "Ecumenism," Orthodox monasticism in the contemporary world and other subjects. The Menologion makes available for the first time a convenient listing of Athonite saints, nowhere else so compactly available.

The beauty of **The Holy Mountain** is the absolutely lucid way in which the material is presented—with a clarity that even the most uninitiated lay reader can understand but also with a sincerity and authority that any scholar will appreciate and churchman respect. Dr. Cavarinos knows his subject well—not merely in publications but as a living tradition which he himself has lived and continues to respect and study. In a secular world and a secular Church that often misunderstands the purpose and mission of this largest community of Orthodox Christian monks anywhere in the world, Dr. Cavarinos seeks to interpret their message as it involves "avoidance of the

world, self-concentration, dedication to the love of God and the keeping of His commandments through strict bodily and spiritual purity" (Archimandrite Gabriel of Dionysiou Monastery). Dr. Cavarinos cites Father Gabriel who emphasizes that it was Basil the Great, the teacher and organizer of Eastern Orthodox monasticism **par excellence**, who exhorted the monks "to withdraw from the world, and to have as their mission an entirely exemplary life, so that through it the monastic life might be praised and the name of God be glorified . . . Orthodox Monasticism has for its mission . . . devotion to God, love towards Him in the first place, and in the second place love towards men, which it practices in relation to monastics, especially within brotherhoods, and towards pilgrims and visitors who come to the holy monastic establishments . . ." (p. 118)

A book like **The Holy Mountain** needs to be studied in the light of the history of Eastern Christianity and the contemporary world. Though an anti-monastic spirit pervades our age and the madness of tourism permeates every aspect of modern Greek life and now even threatens to make inroads on Mount Athos, and the number of men committing themselves to a religious life on the Holy Mountain is growing smaller, there are many Greeks, Russians, Serbians, Bulgarians, and Rumanians who have infused Mount Athos with their own spiritual lives and have maintained, in the words of Father Theokletos of Dionysiou, that "The Holy Mountain will always remain as it is, a place of repentance, of purification and of incessant praising of the Lord, and a Monastic Center that continues the ancient monastic tradition of the Orthodox Church" (p. 131).

Dr. Cavarinos's latest work on Mount Athos will not only provide the interested reader with valuable information but may even open up religious vistas and understanding of the nature of Orthodox Christian monastic life never before realized, experienced, or understood. No student of Orthodox Christianity and no Orthodox Christian should pass this book by.

JOHN E. REXINE
Colgate University

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

A THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY CONFESSION

By STANLEY S. HARAKAS

Introduction

One of the earliest controversies in the history of the Church was the issue regarding the possibility of the forgiveness of sins committed by Christians after baptism. One of the tragedies of the controversy was that proponents of either side of the issue found the very question of forgiveness a cause of separation and schism. Montanists and others on the one hand emphasized the sufficiency of forgiveness in Baptism, denying any subsequent reconciliation; certain gnostic sects on the other hand argued for deliberate sinning on the part of Christians so that "grace would abound". This condition of extremes is a situation which the Church has faced ever since in practically every area of its interest and concern. In fact, two Rockefeller research scholars at Harvard University's Divinity School have argued that the Church has always dealt with its doctrinal problems by sampling the extreme aspects of a given issue and then adopting its own formulation which includes both affirmations in an acceptable form, and in dynamic relationship.¹

In surveying some of the literature on the Sacrament of Holy Confession, it became clear that the issue is still fraught with the danger of extremes which remain out of contact with each other and which do violence to Christian truth by collapsing one aspect of the Christian affirmation about sin, reconciliation and forgiveness.

It is my intention in this paper to approach the discussion of the Sacrament of Holy Confession by means of a model which will serve, hopefully, to bring what we have labeled extreme positions into a dynamic tension, for which we will use the traditional names of mystery and paradox. It is hoped that an examination of the dynamic aspects of sin, followed by a survey of the dynamic aspects of the whole drama of forgiveness and reconciliation, will lead us to a dynamic understanding of the Sacrament itself. In the remainder of this introductory section I

intend briefly to sketch the model according to which we will treat our material. In the first part of the body of the paper I will attempt to outline the Church's understanding of sin in the framework of a model of dynamic mystery or dynamic paradox. In the second part of the paper I will seek again, in broad outline, to place the whole drama of divine reconciliation in the same framework. Both of these treatments will then act as preliminaries for a sketch of the doctrine of the Sacrament of Holy Confession in the same dynamic terms.

The Model of Paradox

The model which this paper uses for its treatment of the question of the Sacrament of Holy Confession may be described as a model of dynamic mystery or dynamic paradox. It is taken from the classic affirmations of the Church in its early Christological and Trinitarian affirmations and is most clearly seen in the dogmatic *horoi* or decisions of the first four Ecumenical Councils, though the model is evident in all Councils up to and including the seventh. In defending and defining the content of its faith, the Church has always insisted on the priority of its experience and the continued witness of its Founder and His direct disciples. It is on the basis of the Kerygma and the Scriptures and the continuing living experience of its own tradition that the Church has constructed its understanding of its truth. Reason's arguments sought to build on the revelatory experiences and as the Church applied the categories of reason to its varying experiences it was able to develop its faith into certain intelligible statements. For instance it was able ultimately to say in the Creed of Nicaea that Jesus was "made man" and later it could affirm at Chalcedon that He was "perfect in His humanity . . . a true human being . . . of the same essence as we according to His humanity."² These statements were rational and logical requirements of its revelatory experience. Parallel to this, the same process of definition took place with regard to the divinity of Christ. The revelatory experiences to which it was subject required the rational and intelligible statement of that experience. Thus the Creed of Nicaea taught that the "Lord Jesus Christ" was "the Son of God . . . very God of very God . . . of one Essence with the Father", and the dogmatic decree of Chalcedon defined that revelatory experience in terms of Jesus' being "perfect in His divinity . . . truly God . . . of the same essence of the Father . . ."³ Now the evident results of this procedure were two, at least for the purposes of the development of

our model. The first was that both Creed and doctrinal definition were attempts to formulate in rational terms the content of the Church's revelatory experience. Faithfulness to the empirical facts required the formulation of a rational statement which represented the facts of each separate affirmation. But the second aspect is equally important. The rational attempts to conceive and conceptualize aspects of the revelatory experience (in this case Christ's humanity on one hand and Christ's divinity on the other) could not and did not extend to synthesizing the two truths. The result was a paradox or mystery with which the Church was content to live. Sergius Bulgakov prefers the term antinomy for this state of affairs and he describes the process quite succinctly and clearly for our purpose. He says:

An antinomy simultaneously admits the truth of two contradictory, logically incompatible, but ontologically necessary assertions. An antinomy testifies to the existence of a mystery beyond which human reason cannot penetrate. This mystery nevertheless is actualized and lived in religious experience. All fundamental dogmatic definitions are of this nature . . . (The) paradoxes of faith . . . are inevitable, not because the divine reality is self-contradictory, but because when we "objectify" it all our judgments are in some measure falsified . . . there should always be a sense of tension between the two opposite sides of our paradoxes, driving us back to their source in our actual religious experience.⁴

The failure to do this has always resulted in the collapsing of one or the other aspect of the full Christian experience into its opposite. This was always seen as a failure rationally and convincingly to convey the full meaning of the Christian revelatory experience. The consequence of this was distortion of the Christian experience and was thus classified as heresy, a false doctrine which was in error because it preferred to dissolve the tension between the antinomies of the Christian experience.

This then is the model against which I would like to draw, in bold strokes, a theology of the Sacrament of Holy Confession. There is need, I believe, to emphasize all sides of the Christian experience of forgiveness and reconciliation, to keep them in a dynamic tension and not to succumb to the temptation of subsuming all experiences under the rubric of one. In other words, we hope to sketch out a balanced model of the dynamic paradox or

mystery of the Sacrament of Holy Confession which resists the temptation to reduce Christian experience to a formula which perhaps satisfies the reason of some while distorting the experience of all.

I

The Dynamic Mystery Of Sin: The Setting For The Need Of Confession and Forgiveness

The Christian experience of the event and condition of sin has led to a multitude of attempts to define it. In the Old Testament the Hebrew word *hattat* and the Septuagint word ἁμαρτία carry the same connotation of missing the mark. Other Hebrew words for sin indicate "straying from the right path", "distortion", "rebellion" as well as "evil-doing". In the New Testament the idea of the non-fulfillment of the will of God is the bedrock of the idea of sin. "Thy will be done on earth" is a characteristic phrase.⁵ Other images of sin have been used by both Scripture and the Fathers of the Church. The Fourth Gospel characterizes it as darkness and death as does Eastern Christian liturgical piety. Clement of Alexandria saw it as a perverse form of irrationality.⁶ Chrysostom saw it as ingratitude and insult,⁷ an idea picked up later by Anselm and emphasized in a feudal society which was in a particular position to appreciate it thus defined.⁸ Other expressions with which the Christian experience has sought to define sin are transgression, disobedience, unlawful act, failure, a defective act, impiety, a debt or trespass, an injustice and inequity.⁹

However, in spite of the plethora of adjectival descriptions nearly all of these can be reduced and have been so reduced in the mainstream of Christian thinking to two fundamental approaches. The one is relational in character and the other legal. On the one hand are those expressions or concepts which see sin essentially as the breaking of the relationship of love between man and God, and also between man and his fellowman. On the other there are those expressions which lend themselves readily to the understanding that the essential nature of sin is the disobedience of the law of God. That the Roman legal tradition of the West found the understanding of sin as violation of the law of God more appealing does not surprise us. There is much biblical and patristic support for the idea. On the other hand the Eastern patristic tradition tended to see the character of sin in the fact that man was not sharing in and responding to the action, activity, and energy of God on his behalf. Irenaeus writes for instance that

"the glory of God is a living man; and the life of man consists in beholding God."¹⁰ But "separation from God is (spiritual) death" in the words of one of St. Irenaeus' commentators.¹¹ An Eastern Christian theologian, Constantine Callinicos, writing in 1909, expressed the idea characteristically in the following words:

If religion is defined and is the innermost bond of man with God, and if sin is nothing other than the opposing force which seeks to destroy that bond with satanic passion and to snatch the child from the arms of its Creator, than Christianity . . . must needs present itself in no other light than as an enemy of this opposing power and as a restorer of the broken bond.¹²

I do not believe that it is necessary to document the legal understanding of sin which became common practice not only in Roman Catholic catechetical instruction, but also in the Protestant sectarian and perfectionist traditions. The point however is that there is always the danger and the temptation of allowing the one to be swallowed up by the other. If it is true that in the past in western Christian traditions the idea of "sin as disobedience to law" was dominant, the present corrective re-emphasis of the idea of sin as the break of the relationship between God and man and between man and his fellow-man seems to be moving toward the other pole. No one has done this more powerfully in recent times than Joseph Fletcher. His definition of love as the only intrinsic good,¹³ his exclusion of law as a norm,¹⁴ his understanding of justice merely as love distributed,¹⁵ and his admitted relativism¹⁶ are the collapse of the one pole of the traditional understanding of sin into the other. It is thus possible in his situationist ethic to pronounce, in certain cases, right and good, those acts which by a scriptural and patristic standard would be characterized as sinful. In contrast, faithfulness to our model requires that the two affirmations (sin as broken relationship and sin as disobedience to God's law and will) must be affirmed side by side. The first attests to the experience of sin in the Christian Community as a personal separation from the source of light and life and strength and power. As separation from God it is meonic, it is the absence of reality. St. John of Damascus says in this connection "evil, then, is nothing else than the absence of the good, just as darkness is the absence of light".¹⁷ Yet, if the breaking of the relationship permits Christians to see sin as meonic, as not having the characteristic of true reality, the view of sin as disobedience to the will and law of God points to the empirically real content of

sin experienced as rebelliousness, passion, hatred and positive evil acts of destruction. To collapse the law aspect of sin into the relational aspect of sin as Fletcher does is to lose the Christian experience of the concrete power of sin. It is this same danger which is attendant to all meonic concepts of evil. That is why the Eastern Church has always felt the need for correctives in dealing with this issue.¹⁸ On the other hand to collapse the relational aspect of sin into the law aspect of sin is to depersonalize and make rigidly formalistic a living human experience. The answer, then, according to our model is to do neither. To keep a place for sin as the violation of God's commandment and will, while keeping alive the sense of sin as a separation from the source of life and the breaking of a relationship, is the course dictated by our model. It is not necessary to maintain an absolute one to one parity between the two. Certainly the relational aspect of our understanding of sin especially as a denial of God's love and the denial of love as the primary root of human evil can be maintained without denying the character of sin as concrete disobedience to the law of God. Maximos the Confessor, the 7th Century vigorous opponent of Monotheletism seems to have put his finger right on the issue when he wrote the following words with which we conclude this application of the question of the nature of sin vis-à-vis our model:

Just as it is the characteristic of disobedience to sin, so it is the characteristic of obedience to act virtuously. And just as disobedience is accompanied by the violation of the commandment and separation from the giver of the command, so it is that obedience consists of the fulfillment of commandments and unity with the giver of the command. Thus, he who keeps, through obedience, the command has done the right and has kept unsundered the loving unity between himself and the giver of the command.¹⁹

II

The Dynamic Mystery of Reconciliation: The Multiple Dimensions of God's Forgiveness of Man

We now turn our attention to several aspects of the sacrament of Holy Confession as an act of grace from God towards man. It is, of course, not our intention here to provide a full exposition of this act of reconciliation. Rather, we hope, in accordance with our model, to point to certain affirmations which have the tendency

of absorbing each other in Christian thought as it seeks to comprehend the various dimensions of the divine act of reconciliation as it occurs in Holy Confession. For this purpose we may analyze the act of divine forgiveness into its transcendent, imminent and present dimensions.

The transcendent dimension of forgiveness is to be seen in the figure of God the Father. It is of interest that all five passages which use the term *katallage* or reconciliation in the New Testament in its theological sense use the word with God as the subject and God as the "sole initiator of this movement of reconciliation, which is unaffected by the attitude of His Creatures. It is He who has decided upon this action and who unceasingly fulfills it: 'All this is from God' (2 Cor. 5:18)" says Bouttier.²⁰ One of the classic Christian terms which expresses this gracious man-directed love of God is philanthropy. God's "philanthropia" is one pole of a two-fold affirmation about God's attitude toward men. The well known study of Demetrios Constantelos may serve as a focus of this emphasis for our purpose here. In the third chapter of his book, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, he traces the biblical and patristic tradition which emphasizes the mercy, love, forgiving, agapeic attitude of God which seeks man's justification, redemption, salvation and sanctification.²¹

If then, the one pole of the attitude of God toward man in the plan of reconciliation is "philanthropia", what is the other? The second pole is found in the role of God as Creator and it finds itself expressed in various concepts all of which serve to point to a stable and structured expectation of God's action in man and man's society. We can discern a common direction in such varied positions as the emphasis on the positive will of God for man (a characteristic emphasis of Eastern Orthodox thinking),²² or natural law (a characteristic emphasis of Roman Catholic thought),²³ or the orders of creation (a characteristic of Reformation thinking).²⁴ The common affirmation to be found in these positions is that God has also established for the sake of humanity, a kind of "nature of things", an order and a pattern, expressing God's will, to which human beings are required to conform. For the purposes of our model, let us call this second pole, order and righteousness. If we remain faithful to our model, the pole of God's philanthropy on the one hand and the pole of God's expectation of righteousness based on the created order on the other hand will remain in a dynamic tension of paradox.

The collapse of one into the other is also the betrayal of these truths. The over-emphasis on the pole of order and patterned expectation has always led to an attempt to freeze the *status quo*, to appeal to Divinity in order to maintain political conservatism. When the forgiving, merciful and philanthropic concern of God is collapsed into the appeal to order, religion truly becomes an "opiate of the people". The classic example in the West, but of course not by any stretch of the imagination the only one, was Martin Luther's social conservatism. In relation to the question of the Sacrament of Holy Confession, as we shall see, the tendency to emphasize the pole of order and righteousness led to the creation of a vast portion of Canon Law (which cannot be understood without reference to the Sacrament of Holy Confession) and of even more practical importance, a whole literature of "Penitentials", i.e. handbooks of casuistic guidance for Confessors based primarily on the retributive idea of the act of penance.²⁵ The emphasis on order all but wiped out the emphasis on **philanthropia**.

However, the other possibility is equally real, in which the emphasis on **philanthropia** drowns out the claims of order, pattern and the nature of things as they are and should be. One of the phenomena which seems to be doing this is the mood of our times. Paul Goodman's well known article on this topic in the *New York Times* entitled the "New Reformation" saw the protests of the youth of the past decade in a strictly religious context. He holds that they are in fact profoundly religious and that this has taken the form of a denial that "there is really a nature of things" and "that it (is) important only to be human, and all else would follow". A recent *Psychology Today* study seems to indicate that this point of view seems to continue into our times.²⁶ Goodman analyzes what being human means in this context for these youth and he defines it primarily in terms reminiscent of a philanthropy characterized by an absence of condemnation and judgment. He writes

But the most powerful magic . . . is the close presence of other human beings, without competition, without one upmanship. The original sin is to be on an ego trip that isolates . . . The extraordinary rock festivals at Bethel and on the Isle of Wight are evidently pilgrimages . . . and the gist of (them) was that people were nice to one another.²⁹

Thus the sex and the pot and the disinterestedness in what the law or what the established patterns of life might be: philan-

thropy, "love for man", swallows them all. In penitentialistic terms its classic expressions were anomianism and the downgrading or the elimination of the Sacrament of Holy Confession and its substitution by a general confession which presumes mercy of God without concern for personal responsibility to the moral order.

The course again, in accordance with our model, is neither to collapse philanthropy into order, nor order into philanthropy but to maintain a dynamic tension of paradox between the two poles, without resolving the tension. Again, that does not mean that there is a one to one absolute correlation between the two. This tension between God's *philanthropia* and his claim upon us for order and righteousness is described and maintained in a statement such as the following by Father Constantelos:

. . . the *philanthropia* of God has limits. God is also righteous, and His justice manifests itself when man abuses God's *philanthropia* for man. Theodoretos of Cyrus, who expounds this view, says that as God is merciful to the penitent so is He just to those who do not appropriate His long-suffering *philanthropia*. He uses both *philanthropia* and punishment because of His *dikaiosyne* or justice. Nevertheless, in general God is *philanthropos* and humanitarian in His relationship with men.³⁰

There are at least two poles, also, in the significance of the redemptive work of Jesus Christ which effect directly the Sacrament of Holy Confession and which need to be kept in the dynamic tension of paradox, too, if the truth in each instance is not to be lost. This we may call for our purposes here as the immanent dimension of forgiveness and it centers not on the Father but on the Incarnate Son, the person of Jesus Christ. The one aspect of the pole is the sufficiency of the saving work of Jesus Christ. The Reformation on the basis of the great Pauline witness made its emphasis that man is saved by faith alone in the saving and redeeming work of Jesus Christ. This pole of truth which lays the full weight of salvation, redemption, and forgiveness in the work of Christ we may call "grace". The emphasis on this pole is the overwhelming fact that God has acted and that man can only accept or reject the redemptive act. It refers to the "power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith" in the words of St. Paul (Rom. 1:16) for in reality "it depends not on man's will or exertion, but upon God's mercy" (Romans 9:16).

While this exclusive primacy of grace is emphasized on the one hand, the role of man's freedom to choose, to "work out" his salvation, in his imperfection, to develop the spiritual life for the realization of that salvation in the life of the individual and the community must be emphasized on the other hand. Thus the same Paul in Ephesians (4:15) declares that "we are to grow up in every way into Him who is the head, into Christ" and He prays for the Colossians that they "may be filled with the knowledge of His will" and that they may "lead a life worthy of the Lord bearing fruit in every good work and increasing in the knowledge of God (1:9:10). For our purposes, then, we may label the other pole "growth", emphasizing man's contribution to his own salvation, his uneven and faltering efforts to increase "in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" to use the phrase found in 1 Peter (3:18). The exclusive emphasis on the second pole is Pelagianism. The exclusive emphasis on the first is a purely forensic understanding of redemption. When applied to the question of repentance and forgiveness, the all-sufficiency of grace on the one hand and the requirement of growth implying frequent failure and reorientation on the other find many interesting applications. James G. Emerson, Jr. in his book entitled *The Dynamics of Forgiveness*³² provides us with an extremely useful view of this dynamic paradox. The emphasis on "grace" he calls a concern with the "context" of forgiveness. Man here relates directly with the Savior, with mystical identification, with sharing in the divine life. Faith, worship, mysticism, sacramental life, form its focus. The other pole emphasizes in one way or another the role of man. It sees man as incomplete, as growing toward an unrealizable perfection and concerns itself with the specific means by which forgiveness may be made concrete and real for the individual. Its categories are obedience, disobedience, forgiveness, growth, increase in godliness. This, Emerson calls an emphasis on the "instrumentation" of forgiveness. At its sharpest state of division, the Church faced the question in terms of the forgiveness of sins committed after Baptism. The one position was a strict one, represented by Tertullian for whom serious or "deadly" sins following baptism were unforgivable, though less serious ones were forgivable. The *Shepherd of Hermas*, however, in the early second century argued for one such forgiveness and little by little the Church's position became more accepting of the sinner after Baptism so that by the end of the Novatian Schism a century after Hermas' writings all sins were considered forgivable.³³ But the

issue still holds an ambiguity for which our terms "grace" and "growth" may still stand as symbols. In the forgiveness granted or realized through the Sacrament, did repentance and the tears and the alms and the years of abstinence from Holy Communion which accompanied the development of the Sacrament effectually displace the consciousness of the saving grace of God in Jesus Christ? The Reformation may be seen in this light. The extreme emphasis on the "growth" pole in medieval penitential practice seemed to the Reformers to be a denial of the grace of God in practice. As a result, Luther rejected penances and man's portion in growth through works of any kind. Yet there was a truth denied in both positions. Effective and practical denial of the free gift of grace on the one hand seemed to be the legacy of the medieval penitential tradition. But what is lost in the Reformation approach is the serious concern with the struggle of the Christian to be again, in the words of St. Paul, "transformed by the renewal of (his) mind, that (he) may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect" (Romans 12:2). When growth is collapsed into grace, then concrete acts of forgiveness, the spiritual struggle, and moral transfiguration are lost, and with it the need for the Sacrament of Holy Confession. But when grace is collapsed into growth, man's own efforts at self-salvation dominate his concerns. Is it any wonder in today's age when the pole of grace is rejected by an over-sophisticated society, that its youth seek salvation on their own terms: sex, speed, Zen, or rock?

But it need not be this way. In accordance with our model, a synergy of grace and growth is a distinct possibility. A classic expression which serves beautifully to define the dynamics of the imminent dimension of forgiveness through the Son of God, Jesus Christ, is found in 1 Corinthians 3:9 in which St. Paul writes "we are co-workers with God". Panagiotes Trembelas in his *Commentary of the Epistles of the New Testament* interprets:

Workers of God working together with him. (Then, quoting Theophylactos) "co-workers with the purpose of God, cooperating with His will to save". But we are not co-workers on an equal basis and upon the same level as He. Rather, we are subject to His commands, and in immediate dependence and under His guidance, as instruments in His hands, that we do this work. He is the primary cause of the work and guide of the great work of the gospel. It is within His purview that we, His co-workers fulfill our tasks.³⁴

All of this takes place within the living presence of the pentecostal experience. The redemptive work of Jesus is realized, increases and bears fruit in the Holy Spirit. Gustaf Aulén has summarized it beautifully when he says that through Jesus' work

the power of evil is broken; that is to say, not that sin and death no longer exist, but that, the devil having been once and for all conquered by Christ, His triumph is in principle universal, and His redemptive work can go forward everywhere, through the Spirit who unites men with God and "deifies" them.³⁵

This mention of the Spirit leads to another duality of poles in the context of what we might call the present dimension of reconciliation "for the Spirit helps us in our weakness" (Rom. 8:26) and is the source of Christian living (Romans 8, 1 Corinthians 2 and 12, Galatians 5). That duality refers to the locus or place of forgiveness, or to use Emerson's phrase, its "instrumentation". Where does forgiveness take place? What are the channels of the mediation of forgiveness? In accordance with our model one pole will obviously be the Sacrament of Holy Confession in which the very concrete and specific manner of the Christian expresses repentance, and receives assurances of the forgiveness of sins through absolution. There is a long history of scholarly and polemical effort to discredit this Sacrament as an authentic expression of the Christian teaching. Yet, the empowering words of the apostolic absolution of sins found in Matthew 16:19, Matthew 18:18 and John 20:23 seem to have been rapidly followed in Church practice with the formal confession of sins before Bishops and later, Priests. Evidence from Ignatius of Antioch (Epistle to the Philadelphians, VIII, 1), Tertullian (*De Paenitentia*, Chapter 9 and *De Pudicitia*, Chapter 18), Origen (2nd Homily on Leviticus: Homily XVII on Luke, and Homily V, 3 on Leviticus), Cyprian *De Lapsis*, 16 and 29 and Epistles IX, 1: XI, 2) as well as many other early writers support both its antiquity and authenticity.³⁶ Whatever the case, the fact is that the Sacrament of Reconciliation has been a continuing factor in the spiritual life of the Church and the locus for forgiveness of sins in its life.

However, the forgiving action of the Holy Spirit appears not to be limited to the Sacrament of Holy Confession and this forms the other pole of the present dimension of reconciliation, the Christian life as a whole. "The Spirit blows where it will" (John 3:8). The Church has always seen forgiveness as available to the

faithful within the total framework of the Church's life. For the early Church, prayer, fasting, and most importantly, almsgiving as expressions of repentance and remorse were thought as effective means of forgiveness of sins. Almsgiving seems to be one of the criteria for entrance into the Kingdom in Jesus' teaching (Matthew 25:35-46 and Matthew 6:2-4).³⁷ Almsgiving as an important aspect of Christian life rapidly increased in importance so that Augustine's position can be summarized and quoted as follows:

At the heart of penance is almsgiving. The greatest form of almsgiving is forgiveness of others who have wronged one. For to give a man who seeks pardon is itself a giving of alms and accordingly, our Lord's saying 'Give alms, and behold all things are clean to you' applies to every useful act of mercy. ³⁸

The Sacraments present themselves, also, as arenas of forgiveness and reconciliation. The Eucharist is not only presented as offering forgiveness with the repetition of the words of institution ("this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" Matthew 26:28), but the whole liturgical action is the making real of the Kingdom of God, a Kingdom of forgiveness and reconciliation, a point admirably developed in reference to the Orthodox Divine Liturgy by Father Alexander Schmemmann in his study *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*.³⁹ The frequent appeals for mercy and forgiveness in all forms of the Eucharist, so readily subsumed in the simple formula, "Lord have mercy" show clearly that the Eucharist is also a locus of forgiveness as a work of the Holy Spirit. The words of institution of the Sacrament of Chrismation express the same point: "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the Presbyters of the Church and let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins he will be forgiven" (James 5:15). A survey of the liturgical expressions of all the other Sacraments in the practice of the Church will show, I am sure, the same anticipation of forgiveness.

In addition, common worship carries the same presupposition of appeal for and expectation of forgiveness. In the rich and varied tradition of the Eastern Orthodox Church it is to be found everywhere, from the Churching of a mother and her baby on the fortieth day after birth through the blessings of inanimate objects, to prayers for healing, to the funeral service itself. This is perhaps nowhere more profoundly registered than in the Orthodox

doxology. Rationally one would expect a doxology to be an act of the pure adoration of God. Yet of its twenty distinct stanzas (not counting the exact repetitions) nine stanzas are appeals for mercy or for forgiveness of sins or for aid to keep from sinning.⁴¹ Finally, it ought to be pointed out that a large portion of Church discipline, i.e. Canon Law, functions on the presupposition that it deals within the whole framework of the forgiveness of sins and the reconciliation of the sinner to the body of Christ.⁴²

Thus there are two poles where the Holy Spirit makes the present dimension of forgiveness real: concretely and specifically in the Sacrament of Holy Confession and in a more diffused manner in the whole Christian life. The temptation here, in accordance with our model, is to collapse the one into the other. The tendency of historical theological definition in the history of Christian thought seems to have sought to down-grade the general Christian experience of forgiveness while insisting on the absolute exclusiveness and necessity of the Sacrament of Holy Confession for forgiveness of sins. For example the Council of Trent promulgated a *Catechism for Parish Priests* in which

the high Roman Catholic view of the authority of the priest is affirmed. The words "I absolve thee", signify that remission of sins is effected by the administration of this Sacrament. How thankful should sinners be that God has bestowed on priests this power! Penance restores us to the grace of God. There is no hope for remission by any other means.⁴³

Christos Androutsos, the well-known Professor of Orthodox Dogmatics is able to argue that

. . . the general opinion that one is able to achieve direct forgiveness from God without need of confession to the Spiritual Father, is considered by the Orthodox as impious and foolish . . .⁴⁴

In both cases the pole representing the experience of the life of the Church as a Community of reconciliation is collapsed into the pole representing the specific sacramental tradition.

On the other hand, the denial of the Sacrament of Holy Confession in Protestantism generally has meant that forgiveness of sins has become a highly subjective experience. In sectarian expressions it has become the drive for the creation of a strict, unbending, rigorous, and charity-less literalist and legalistic understanding of Christianity, a fact delineated by Ernst Troetsch so

clearly in his *Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*.⁴⁵ In mainline Protestantism it seems rapidly leading to a secularization of much of the reconciling function of the Church. The alliance of psychology with religion in some of its practitioners leads to a deterioration of the element of gracious forgiveness and the relativising of the reconciling, forgiving and redemptive function of the Church.⁴⁶

The errors on both sides can be avoided if the two poles are kept in dynamic tension and the Sacrament seen as the focus for the sharpest expression of forgiveness and as a necessary aspect of the living of the Christian life in the Spirit, while the Christian life as a whole both in its corporate, and personal dimension is the more diffused realization of one of the ever-present activities of the Holy Spirit in the lives of the faithful.

This three-fold dimensioned dynamic of reconciliation, expressed by reference to the Trinity also points to the need of keeping each of these three multiple dimensions in a creative and dynamic relationship. Just as the Father is distinguished from the Son and the Spirit, and the Son is distinguished from the Father and the Spirit, and the Spirit is distinguished from the Father and the Son, in the Mystery of the Trinity, so is it true that the tension of philanthropy and ultimate moral order, firstly; and the tension of grace and growth, secondly; and the tension of the Sacrament of Holy Confession and Christian life as a whole, thirdly, should not be resolved in favor of any one of the three. It is necessary that in the very exercise of the Sacrament of Reconciliation all three of these dynamic mysteries should be kept in balance and effectively expressed.

Subsuming all of the other dimensions to one will of necessity cause distortion and a falsified view of forgiveness, redemption and reconciliation. We may now turn to the third and final part of this paper in which we seek to present in broad outline what the Sacrament of Reconciliation would be like if all of the aspects of the dynamic and paradoxical model we have delineated so far were applied to an understanding of the theology of this Sacrament.

III

The Dynamic Mystery of Forgiveness Realized: The Sacrament of Holy Confession

There is no intent here to present a full theology of the Sacrament of Holy Confession. Our interest is to reflect some of the motifs already discussed in a general view of the Sacrament. Thus we will not seek to document all that is suggested here by reference either to past or present practice in a systematic manner. The first concern we have is to sketch the context of the Sacrament.

The *Heilsgeschichte* which serves as the background of the Sacrament as understood in the patristic theological perspective is familiar enough, I believe. Briefly, it can be stated as follows.

The apophetic theological approach first emphasizes the complete unknowability of the essence of God, while pointing to the activities or energies of God as they relate to the world. Thus, the absolute character of God is unknown, but God's energies, i.e. His relatedness to the world which He has created are in part known. As we know them, in a real, yet far from absolute sense, we know God.

God created the world freely and without constraint. There are no pre-existing ideal patterns or absolutes according to which God created the world. This is just one possible world brought into being positively and concretely by the autexousion (self-determining will) of God.⁴⁷ So also, was man created in the image and likeness of God. The truth of this revelation is not directly contingent upon its historicity, yet it is convenient to speak of it in historical categories. Its description as such maintains its value as "myth" in the technical sense of that word. However, a facile rejection of the possibility of historicity within the framework of an evolutionary view of human development, is not an absolute necessity either. Accordingly we can say that man had in the "image" the larger part of a divine-like nature and in the "likeness" the potential to fulfill and complete his destiny so as to become "divine". But, in exercising his free will, man chose not to realize his potential and in rebelling against His creator he henceforth lost the potential and marred and weakened the "image" of God in him. But it was not destroyed completely. "The natural precepts which he had from the beginning implanted in mankind"⁴⁸ are the basic and necessary presuppositions of

social and therefore individual life. This natural law is a moral law basic to man as a human being in society and it is to be understood as a positive, intrinsic factor of our human nature; a part of the divine image in us, distorted as that image might be. The Fathers of the Church teach that one of the best statements of this fundamental moral law is to be found in the Decalogue, but the Decalogue is not an absolute form of it, nor is such an absolute form required, because it is written in the hearts of all men.⁴⁹ With this basic moral equipment, human beings can react and respond with the same free will as they did previously, either living in harmony with it or rebelling against it. Among those who lived in accordance with it are the personages of all ages known by the Fathers as the "righteous ancients". In spite of these exceptions, the vast majority of men were in need of redemption and restoration. From a moral point of view, Christ's saving work restores to man the "likeness", i.e. the potential to fulfill his destiny to become God-like, to become "perfect as his Father in heaven is perfect". And this means nothing less than becoming completely, fully, and totally human. Without the work of Christ, this is impossible. In this sense all men and women are in reality less-than-human, less than what they can be and ought to be, and thus all are in need of redemption. The prototype of the kind of human being we ought to be is Christ; the prototype of what society should be is the eschatological Church. What is and what ought to be are on a continuum: the minimum for human social, and individual existence is the natural law as we have defined it; the maximum is the fullest realization of the Christ-like image in our social and individual existence, i.e. sainthood for the individual and the Kingdom of God for society. The Church in the moral sense exists as the arena where the Holy Spirit forgives, supports and strengthens the Christian in his struggle for growth into the image of God.

Morally, where does this place us? It places us at a point of tension between anarchical disorder on the one side and eschatological perfection on the other. Morally it requires of each person to realize as much as possible the image of God in his own life and in the society in which he lives (in the Church community especially). The patristic concept of morality then is dynamic, growing, fulfilling, perfecting. But it is not so in a narrow sectarian way; it knows that the pressures and forces of evil abound but it has faith and trust that the grace of God abounds even more. So there is need for struggle, for *askesis*, for "invisible

warfare" against evil and for the fulfillment of the Christ-like image. In the struggle for growth there is rejoicing in progress, but there is always also the recognition that we continually fall short and so there is always the liturgical petition "Lord have mercy" and the Jesus Prayer ("Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon me a sinner"), and more concretely the Sacrament of Holy Confession. An eighth century Father of the Church, St. Peter of Damascus, has provided us with a short summary of this dynamic of growth and grace.

The beginning of every good act is the natural knowledge given by God, whether it come by man through the Scriptures, or by angelic communication, or as given through divine baptism. This knowledge is given for the protection of the spiritual life of each faithful Christian and is known as the conscience . . . It also serves as a reminder of the divine commands of Christ. Through them the grace of the Holy Spirit is kept in the life of the baptized Christian, if he wills to observe them. In addition to the knowledge, there is the need to exercise choice. This is the beginning of salvation; that is, for man to abandon his own wilful desires and thoughts and, instead, do the thoughts and will of God. If one is able to do this there will not be found in all of creation any thing, or object or place able to restrain him from becoming, as God from the beginning intended, God's own image and likeness, a contingent god, by grace.⁵⁰

With such an understanding, we can turn to the Sacrament of Holy Confession and define the nature of sins committed as violations of the moral law, which is understood as the positive will of God. That violation cannot but be at the same time the rejection and disruption of the personal relationship between God and man. Further, when this is seen in the framework of acts or attitudes after Baptism, committed in the context of the already received and shared in restoration it takes on very serious dimensions. However, this gravity is balanced by the fact that man is a learner, and in the process of growth and development. Sin thus not only violates the will of God, not only breaks the relationship between God and man and man and his fellow man, but it also serves to prohibit men from growth into real humanity and into the full realization of what it means to be the image and likeness of God. Thus sin is also a limiting restricting and confining element to human potential.

The relationship with God can be restored, and the potential for freedom to grow^o can be re-established only if the sin is "forgiven". Forgiveness does not erase the past act. What it does is to erase the consequences of separation and limitation upon the potential of growth. Thus in the words of one student of Christian forgiveness.

As a living experience, forgiveness is needed and is relevant to the condition of man. Without it man cannot live. Without it he cannot grow.⁵¹

As such forgiveness in the early Fathers of the Church was oftentimes referred to as freedom.⁵²

How is this freedom to be regained and how is the broken relationship to be restored? Certainly even here there is no claim to be made by man on the basis of right or privilege before God in an absolute sense. Man can approach the throne of God because God is *philanthropos* and His stable love makes it possible for man to presume the possibility of release from the burden of the separation and the impossibility of being what he could be. But how does one approach the throne of mercy upon which one has no real claim? There must be first a sense of the sin committed, and cognizance of it. There must follow of necessity a true sorrow and shame for having transgressed against the will of God, for having insulted divine generosity, and for having slipped back from the freedom of opportunity to grow toward the fulfillment of one's human destiny into servitude to the powers of evil. Together with this contrition there is need to desire to regain and re-establish the lost relationship and to move forward in freedom in the process of growth toward the fulfillment of the image of God. Where sin has occurred through the violation of God's will regarding our neighbor, reconciliation and restitution are prerequisites, not for forgiveness, but for approaching the throne of mercy. To do less would be evidence of a lack of the sincere desire to restore the relationship with God and to begin again the road to growth.⁵³

Thus, from this point of view, repentance is not a personal or private atonement for sins committed; it is not in any sense an emotional "payment" for the guilt of the sin. It simply is the only way by which we may dare to call again at the throne of mercy. Just as a man who insults his benefactor can approach him again only as a suppliant, so the sinner can make possible forgiveness and restoration of the broken relationship and re-obtain the free-

dom for growth by way of an evident and clear change of direction or change of mind. It is in the light of this fact that the New Testament Greek word for repentance is *μετάνοια* which means a change of mind. The change which permits the possibility of forgiveness and restoration of the relationship is the change from an attitude of egocentrism and rebellion involving a rejection of God's will to one which recognizes the claim of that will and the benefits of obedience to it.

Why is it necessary for the confession to be oral? There are several reasons we could point to. The psychological need for expression of repentance to make it real and fulfill its essential nature is an insight supported by much contemporary psychological theory. One theologian put it categorically several years ago in the following words: ". . . one might say that where there is no desire for confession it is the result and manifestation of the absence of true penitance".⁵⁴ But further, the aspect of "growth" requires that the person repenting also receive guidance, comfort, advice, suggestions for correction and direction. Without oral confession such would not be possible. Even in the light of non-directional counseling such oral confession is a requirement. This will have serious bearing on the nature of imposed penances, a topic we will return to shortly. Further, oral confession in the earliest history of the sacrament was an act done before the whole body of the Church. Despite the draw-backs of such situations, it points to the need for the penitent to be reconciled to the body of the faithful, the Church. Confession to the priest as a representative of the Church not only gives assurance of forgiveness in a concrete way, it also assures the repentant person of his continued membership and solidarity in the Body of Christ.⁵⁵ This identity of the Church with the penitent and the penitent with the Church is graphically illustrated in the oldest extant complete service in the East of the Sacrament of Penance, that of Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, who lived the latter half of the sixth century. In this service the father confessor and the penitent pray together at the beginning of the service. Both kneel together three times. The father confessor is then instructed to ask questions of the penitent with kindness and gentleness and if possible to embrace him and to place the hands of the penitent upon his own head, especially if he sees him suffering and overtaken by unbearable sorrow and shame and in a humble and most peaceful voice he is to say to the penitent 'How are things with you my lord brother or sister'. . .⁵⁷ and he proceeds with the ques-

tions. Oral confession makes the presence of the Church and membership in it a channel and instrumentation of the experience of forgiveness.

What of the content of the confession itself? Since the repentance of the penitent is the *sine qua non* of the act, the details of the confessed sins are not the primary criterion. Enough should be said, however, so that the spiritual father is capable of understanding the condition of the penitent, but there is no need to have every detail, every instance, every aspect of the sin ferreted out. The 102nd Canon of the Fifth-Sixth Ecumenical Council in Trullo very wisely compares the work of the father confessor with that of the physician, whose task it is to find out enough about the patient so to heal him, maintaining the middle road between simple generalities and too detailed specifics for, as it says, "the sickness of sin is not simple but varied and multiformed".⁵⁸

What is the nature of the absolution offered? The absolution restores the relationship between God and Man, it empowers the penitent to continue to grow in the image and likeness of God; that is, it does not remove the history and the fact of the sin, it removes the effects and consequences of the sin. St. Athanasios says, "He who repents ceases from sinning, but he still has the marks of the wounds".⁵⁹ The penitent becomes a new creature again that makes possible his obedience to the will of God and his growth in the divine image. It is the pronouncement of the father confessor which actualizes this: "Whose sins ye forgive, they are forgiven, whose sins ye retain, they are retained". Yet the pronouncement of that forgiveness ought to point to the philanthropy and mercy of God, rather than the power of forgiveness granted to God's agent.⁶⁰

Finally, what is the nature of any penances which the father confessor may choose to require of the forgiven penitent? On the one hand they cannot be acts of atonement, satisfaction, so to speak for the sins committed since the purpose of the Sacrament is to mediate the forgiving grace of God, to restore the relationship, to provide new freedom for growth. Rather, the penances may serve two purposes. The first is to impress upon the penitent the reality of the forgiveness. This is

solely remedial and medicinal and not vindictive and punitive (for) "The Blood of Jesus . . . cleanses us from all sin (1st John 1:7) . . . nor is there any condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus (Romans 8:1).⁶²

Such penances need not be imposed if the father confessor deems it unnecessary, for they are not an essential aspect of the sacrament of Holy Confession. The second purpose of the imposition of penances relates to the penitent's need for guidance, assistance and direction. Penance should be imposed on the basis of the specific condition and needs for the improvement and growth of the penitent. They should be designed and imposed with the specific intent of helping him or her to grow in the Spirit into the image and likeness of God.

The above also has bearing on the frequency of participation in the sacrament. Serious sin needs, of course, immediate therapy, but normally the requirement for growth will not demand an excessively frequent attendance at the sacrament, leaving an important role in forgiveness for the life of the Church in general.

Conclusion

In accordance to our model then, we have sought to delineate the outlines of the Sacrament of Reconciliation so that no one aspect of the dynamic mysteries involved is lost and reduced into one of the other aspects. God's philanthropy and the moral order; the all-sufficient redemptive grace as well as the implication of fall and restoration in the process of growth; the instrumentation of forgiveness in both the Sacrament and in the whole life of the Church are all kept in a dynamic tension. Together they help to describe but not to resolve the mystery of how sin as violation of the moral law, as separation from God and as the arrest of the realization of man's destiny to be fully and truly human, is overcome in this Sacrament variously known by the names of Repentance, Forgiveness, Healing, Reconciliation, Restoration, Penance, and Holy Confession.

FOOTNOTES

1. T. G. Goman, and Ronald S. Lowra "The Development of Orthodoxy: An Historical Model," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, XV (1970), 187-206.
2. From the dogmatic decision of the Fourth Ecumenical Council, Ioannes Karmires, *Τὰ Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μνημεία τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, 1952), I, 165.
3. *Ibid.*
4. See my article "Sergius Bulgakov and His Teaching" in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, VII (1961-1962) especially, p. 104. A similar conclusion is arrived at by means of studies in linguistic analysis and theological statements by Michael Foster in his article "Contemporary British Philosophy and Christian Belief," *Cross Currents*, X, 4 (Fall, 1960).
5. J. J. Von Allmen (ed), *A Companion to the Bible* (N.Y., 1958), pp. 405-10 and Panagiotis Demetropoulos, "*Ἀμαρτία*", *Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἑγκυκλοπαίδεια*, II (1963), 250-55.
6. Paidagogos, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, II, 1. 210.
7. Homilies on Matthew, LXL, 1. in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, X, 376-77.
8. Etienne Gilson, *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1938).
9. Constantine Callinicos, *Ἡ Ἀμαρτία Κατὰ τὴν Χριστιανικὴν Ἀντίληψιν* (2nd ed., Athens, 1958), p. 31.
10. *Against Heresies*, Bk. IV, XX, 7, see also Bk. IV, XX, 5 and Bk. V, XII, 2. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, II, 49, 538.
11. John Romanides, *Τὸ Προπατορικὸν Ἀμάρτημα* (Athens, 1956), pp. 118, 19.
12. Callinicos, *Ἡ Ἀμαρτία*, p. 16.
13. Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia).
14. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-56.
17. *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, PG, XCIV, 973A.
18. See Vasilios Antoniadis' quite vigorous attack on meonic concepts in his *Ἑγχειρίδιον Κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἠθικῆς* (Constantinople, 1927), I. 190-93.
19. Maximos the Confessor, *Περὶ Θεολογίας: Δευτέρα Ἑκατοντὴς Φιλακαλίας τῶν Νηπτικῶν Πατέρων* (Athens, 1960), II, 70.
20. In *A Companion to the Bible*, p. 352. The five passages are Rom. 5:10-11; 11:15; 2 Cor. 5:18-20; Eph. 2:16 and Col. 1:20, 22.
21. (New Brunswick, 1968).
22. See Romanides, *Προπατορικὸν* and Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, (Cambridge, 1973).

23. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Bk. I-II, Questions 90-95, especially question 94.
24. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* (Trans. Olive Wyon, New York, 1931), Vol. II.
25. John T. McNeill, *A History of the Cure of Souls* (New York, 1951), Chapters 6 and 7.
26. "New York Times Magazine", Sept. 14, 1969 p. 32-34, 142-47, 150, 154-55.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 33. See, also, a more recent study with similar conclusions, Robert Wuthnow and Charles Y. Glock, "The Shifting Focus of Faith: A Survey Report", *Psychology Today* (November, 1974), 131-36.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
30. Constantelos, *Philanthropy*, p. 31. The author refers to Theodoretos, *Eccl. History*, Bk. V, 1, 7 as well as Methodios, *On the Resurrection*, Bk. I. 43, 4.
31. See also Col. 2 19 where the idea of growth is applied to the body of believers.
32. (Philadelphia 1964).
33. Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (Rev. ed., New York, 1959), pp. 911-93.
34. **Υπόμνημα εἰς τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης. Ἐπιστολαὶ: Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους - Πρὸς Κορινθίους** (2nd ed., Athens, 1956), p. 260.
35. Gustaf Aulen, *Christus Victor* (New York, 1951), p. 59.
36. Epiphanius Theodoropoulos in "Sacrament of Repentance," **Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια**, VIII (1959-66).
37. See Cecil John Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* (Edinburgh, 1955), pp. 198-99, 285 and ff.
38. Emerson, *Dynamics* p. 123.
39. (Trans. Ashleigh E. Moorhouse, London, 1966). See also Emerson, *Dynamics*, pp. 94-95.
40. Evelyn Underhill, *Worship* (New York, 1937), especially Chapter 1.
41. **Ἱερὰ Σύνοψις καὶ Ἀκολουθία τῶν Παθῶν**, (Athens, 1966), pp. 10, 11, stanzas 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 28.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
43. McNeill, *Souls*, p. 289.
44. **Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας** (2nd ed., Athens 1956), p. 387.
45. Troeltsch, *Social Teachings*, II, 4.
46. This is my main criticism of Emerson's work, which is an heroic attempt to keep the Church in the process of forgiveness and reconciliation. Yet the weak ecclesiology underlying the book opens the door to understandings of forgiveness and "wholeness" which in the end deny the necessity of divine forgiveness and see it a simple

psychological process. See Chapter 2, and especially the conclusion.

47. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, II, 1, 4 and II, 3, 2, and II, 30, 9. Book II, 3, 2 and Bk. II.
48. *Ibid.*, IV, 15, 1.
49. Romans 2:12, 14-15. See my article "The Natural Law Teaching of the Eastern Orthodox Church," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, IX (1963-1964), 215-24; reprinted in Martin Marty and Dean Pearlman (eds.), *New Theology* No. 2 (New York, 1965) pp. 122-33.
50. Peter of Damascus, *Προοίμιον* in *Φιλοκαλία* (Athens, 1960), III, 7, 13-24.
51. Emerson, *Dynamics*, 1. 73.
52. "... the Eastern church leaders seemed to concentrate on a different word for the experience of forgiveness than the word itself. This was the word freedom!" *Ibid.*
53. This treatment is based on Mesoloras' five-fold analysis of repentance in his *Συμβολική της Ὁρθοδόξου Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας: Τὰ Συμβολικά Βιβλία* (Athens, 1904), IV, 302. See also Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (Milwaukee, 1923) pp. 355-70.
54. Constantine Dyovouniotes, *Τὰ Μυστήρια της Ἀνατολικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἐξ ἑποψείας Δογματικῆς* (Athens, 1912, p. 133. Quoted in Gavin, *Some Aspects*, p. 361.
55. Canon 28 of Nikephoros the Confessor takes this into consideration when it cautions confessors not to prohibit Church attendance as penance to those who have sinned secretly, so that others may not "lord over them".
56. See PG, LXXXVIII, 1890-1901 and Morinus, *De Disciplina in Administratione Sacramenti Poenitentiae* (Antwerp, 1682), pp. 77-117. For a thorough analysis of this service see Constantine Callinicos, *Ἡ Μετάνοια* (2nd ed., Athens: 1958).
57. *Ibid.*
58. Canon 102, in Hamilka Alivizatos, *Οἱ Ἱεροὶ Κανόνες* (2nd ed., Athens: 1949), pp. 116-17.
59. *Epistle to Serapion*, 4, 13. PG, XXVL, 656.
60. "Behold, he says to the penitent, through the will of the philanthropic God, who wishes the salvation of all, having come in repentance and having confessed all, you are released from your previous evil works," is a characteristic prayer of the service of Patriarch John the Faster mentioned above.
61. Emerson, *Dynamics*, pp. 122-23. See also Canon 102 of the 5th, 6th Ecumenical Council and others.
62. Frank Gavin, *Some Aspects*, pp. 367-68.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.